

18032

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 10, 1966

also remind you that to the best of my recollection, Secretary Dillon never advocated removal of the 4½ percent interest rate ceiling on long-term government bonds, as you recently did before the House Ways and Means Committee.

I will greatly appreciate your prompt attention to these comments, particularly in connection with the correction of the erroneous and ambiguous statements made by Mr. Barr before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on August 4. These statements must not be permitted to be part of the official record of the Congress.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1966.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary Fowler has asked me to reply to your letter of August 9, 1966 concerning my testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last week.

You are quite correct in stating that I misrepresented the provision of H.R. 14026. I evidently misunderstood Senator PROXMIRE's question, and I did not correct his statement. I might add that none of the Treasury staff who accompanied me caught this error, and the lawyer who reviewed the transcript did not notice it.

To set the record straight I have this morning sent to the Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee the following letter and asked him to distribute it to his Members.

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On Thursday, August 4, 1966, in testimony before your committee, Senator PROXMIRE asked me the following question: 'Yes, Mr. Barr, as I understand it, at one point the House Banking Committee passed a proposal to have a flat limitation of 4½ percent on the interest payments. Was that to apply to negotiable certificates of deposit and what other savings instruments?'

"I answered: 'Yes, sir, on all time and savings accounts, which would include negotiable certificates of deposit.'

"I evidently thought that Senator PROXMIRE used the term 'considered' rather than 'passed' because my answer as printed is not correct. The correct answer is as follows:

"Senator PROXMIRE, the House Banking and Currency Committee has reported H.R. 14026 which provides for a temporary one-year ceiling of 4½ percent on time deposits below \$100,000. Negotiable certificates of deposit are normally denominated in amounts of \$100,000 or more so H.R. 14026 as reported would not have an appreciable impact on negotiable C.D.'s."

"I regret this misunderstanding, and I regret that neither I nor the Treasury staff caught this error before the record was printed.

"I am not certain as to what line of questioning Senator PROXMIRE meant to pursue in the subsequent colloquy. If he meant to inquire as to the impact of placing a ceiling on all C.D.'s, my answers would stand. If he meant to inquire as to my opinions on the impact of the provisions of H.R. 14026, I would be pleased to supply this answer for the record.

Sincerely,

"JOSEPH W. BARR."

If Senator PROXMIRE asks me to comment on H.R. 14026, I would state that the impact of H.R. 14026 and a flat ceiling of 4½ percent on all C.D.'s is quite different. Under the provisions of H.R. 14026 only about \$18 billion out of an approximate \$32 billion total outstanding C.D.'s is covered.

Thus, the impact of H.R. 14026 would be much less drastic than a flat ceiling of 4½ percent on all C.D.'s. However, I have testified before your Committee that a law limiting the rate on C.D.'s under \$100,000 to 4½ percent might well have unpredictable consequences and that funds could move from C.D.'s into money market instruments bearing higher rates.

I have no comments on the other points raised in your letter of August 9 and I believe that the complete record as it stands, including the statements of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation give a fair portrayal of the objectives of the legislation supported by the Coordinating Committee on Bank Supervision.

Permit me to say that I regret this error in the record and appreciate the opportunity to correct it at once.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH W. BARR.

HEALTH EDUCATION

(MR. CAREY (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, since its enactment in 1958, the National Defense Education Act has had far-reaching effects in nearly every area of education.

From the basic act, which concentrated on the sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, and guidance, we have progressed by including such areas as English, reading, history, geography, economics, industrial arts, programs for the disadvantaged, school library personnel, and educational media specialists. Since 1936 we have provided assistance, including teacher training, in the field of vocational education and with the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities we acknowledged the importance of these areas as well.

The one area in the curriculum which to date has received little or no attention from the Congress is that of health education and the training of teachers in that field. A great deal of confusion exists as to what constitutes adequate health instruction. All too often it is combined with other subjects and taught by coaches whose primary interest is producing winning teams, or by English and home economics instructors.

Just as the Congress has rightfully established and supported programs to strengthen the academic, vocational, and technical efforts of the Nation's schools, it is imperative that we now recognize the need to do the same for health education so that it may be placed on the same level as all other subjects.

The first bill which I am introducing today would correct this oversight by amending the National Defense Education Act in two instances:

First. It would make possible the acquisition of laboratory and other equipment by elementary and secondary schools under title III of the act so that our children can be trained in modern approaches to the health problems they encounter in daily living.

Second. It would bring the teaching of health in line with current develop-

ments by amending title XI to furnish support for teacher training programs to be conducted by our institutions of higher learning in order that the qualifications of those who are or will be engaged in the teaching of health subjects can be improved. Fortunately, there are a number of colleges and universities presently offering specialized training in health education at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

Health education has a number of basic contributions to make to individual achievement. Studies indicate a direct correlation between physical fitness and academic achievement, showing that physical weakness is nearly 30 percent higher in children of low mental ability than in those of high intelligence. One out of five children today cannot pass a simple test of physical performance and one-third of all American young men are judged unfit for duty in the Armed Forces for health reasons.

Like so many problems, the pattern of physical neglect begins early in life and the place to correct it is with our young.

Action on the amendments which I am introducing today will strengthen health instruction and provide training institute for teachers in the field. Enactment of this legislation will indicate to educators throughout the country that the Congress does subscribe to the concept of a sound mind in a sound body.

Mr. Speaker, closely related to the amendments I have just offered is a second bill which I am also introducing today to amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act to make school health educators eligible for traineeships under the act. Under the present interpretation of that section these persons are denied such opportunities at institutions of higher learning that provide specialized training in public health and school health education.

What is urgently needed today is a national commitment to health education from the first school years throughout the individual's life.

The legislation I have introduced today will provide the impetus and support to school and college health programs.

FOR AN ALL ASIAN SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

MR. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, like many Members of this body, I have become increasingly heartsick over the tragic events occurring in Vietnam. More and more of our sons have been sent to fight there. More and more of them are being killed. Yet the war seems no closer to termination than it did a year or 2 years ago. Our President has, I am sure, been doing everything possible to end the war, using the strategy which to him appears wisest. I think it is unquestionable that the national objective in Vietnam is peace. The dilemma, however, has been how to achieve it.

In the hope of resolving the dilemma, Mr. Speaker, I found gratification in the

August 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18031

Airline stock prices

	1962		1st 6 months 1966		Monday, Aug. 8, 1966 (close of business)
	High	Low	High	Low	
Eastern.....	27 1/4	15 1/2	123 1/4	74	90 1/2
National.....	12 1/2	5 1/2	104 1/2	65 1/4	70 1/2
Northwest.....	10	5 1/2	124 1/4	58 1/2	111 1/2
TWA.....	14 1/4	7 1/2	101	57 1/2	70 1/2
United.....	17 1/2	9 1/2	74 1/4	49 1/2	60 1/2

¹ Adjusted for 2-for-1 split in 1965.

² Adjusted for 2-for-1 split in 1964 and 1966.

³ Adjusted for 2-for-1 split in 1966.

Even if a share of these stocks were bought at the 1962-highs and sold at the lows of the first half of 1966, the gains would have been from \$32 per share, or 190 percent, to \$53 per share, or 442 percent.

On Monday, August 8, one month after the strike started, the closing stock prices were from 3 times to 11 times the highs of 1962—200 percent to 1,000 percent above the 1962-highs.

AIRLINE FARES

The last general airline rate increase was February 1962—a 3-percent increase. Since then, several small selective decreases have taken place.

August 1962—Family plan, first-class discount, 50 percent.

June 1965—Family plan coach—two-thirds rate for second member and one-third for others, except during peak periods.

August 1965—Baggage allowance liberalized. United cut first-class tickets of over 700 miles by 2 to 15 percent. No jet surcharge for short-haul jets.

March 1966—Twenty-five percent excursion fare discount. Youth fares.

The rate of return on investment last year for the 11 major airlines was 11.5 percent compared with the allowable 10.5 percent rate of return (allowable under CAB regulations).

WESTERN GREYHOUND STRIKE

Earlier this year, the workers of Western Greyhound were on strike for six weeks. Western Greyhound covers eleven western states. The average number of passengers per day is 135,000. But there was no talk in Washington of a national emergency.

The number of passengers per day on the five struck airlines is 150,000. But almost as soon as the strike started, there was talk of a national emergency.

Moreover, the Western Greyhound strike settlement provided \$4.61 an hour for bus mechanics (to \$5.09 in June 1963)—but the hourly rate for top-rated airline mechanics is \$3.52. Yet when a bus runs into mechanical trouble, it can pull over to the side of the road. There is no roadside shoulder for a plane with mechanical trouble.

SERIOUS ERRORS IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT TESTIMONY ON CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT LEGISLATION

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, I wrote Secretary of the Treasury Fowler a letter pointing out serious misstatements of fact in the testimony of Under Secretary Joseph W. Barr given before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on August 4 concerning legislative proposals to end the high interest-rate war between financial institutions.

Today I received a response to the letter I wrote to Secretary Fowler from

Under Secretary Barr. In order that Members of both Houses of Congress might be fully informed of the significant questions raised in this correspondence, I insert my letter to Secretary Fowler and Under Secretary Barr's response at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,

Washington, D.C., August 9, 1966.

Hon. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: After reviewing the testimony of Under Secretary Barr given last week before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 3687 and other bills related to the interest rate situation, I would like to make several comments in regard thereto.

In response to a comment by Senator PROXMIER, Under Secretary Barr stated that the House Banking and Currency Committee had approved a proposal with a flat 4 1/2 percent limitation on all time and savings accounts. As you well know, this is a deplorable misstatement of fact, and I must register my objection to this misrepresentation in the strongest possible terms. H.R. 14026 as reported by this Committee contains a temporary, one-year ceiling of 4 1/2 percent on time deposits only and affects only those under \$100,000 in size. Mr. Barr's testimony failed to include mention of these most explicit conditions contained in H.R. 14026 with respect to the 4 1/2 percent ceiling. Furthermore, he failed to mention that the 4 1/2 percent ceiling does not apply to renewals of presently outstanding CD's carrying a higher rate nor that the bill provides that the 4 1/2 percent ceiling can be raised by the appropriate agencies upon approval of the President.

Furthermore, the essence of Mr. Barr's testimony is that, if the 4 1/2 percent rate ceiling is passed, it may very well cause a financial panic and recession. Unfortunately, Under Secretary Barr misled the Senate Banking and Currency Committee—unintentionally, I am sure—as to the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and I am hereby requesting that you take immediate action to correct the record.

Mr. Barr's testimony also reveals a definite uncertainty on his part as to the impact of the Federal Reserve's action of last December 6 setting off the current rate war. At one point, he states: "It seems clear first of all that excessive competition for savings is having a number of unfortunate effects that deserve attention." Later on in his testimony, Mr. Barr stated: "The purpose of this legislation is two-fold, sir. One, it is to try to curb any potential rate war that might develop in this country . . ." While probably just a matter of semantics, the seeming contradiction in these two statements by Mr. Barr indicate a hesitancy on the part of the Treasury Department to even admit that we do have at the present time excessive interest rate competition of the worst kind and that the results are present for all to see. Perhaps if the Treasury Department had a more concrete grasp of the facts of the present situation, you would not have found it necessary to switch your position several times on remedial legislation.

In this connection, I do not see how the Treasury can have any assurance that the present rate war will be ended by increasing the discretionary authority of the Federal Reserve Board over interest rates. For instance, Senator DOUGLAS asked Mr. Barr this question: "Do you know what rate the Federal Reserve Board has in mind." Mr. Barr responded, "No, sir; we don't." Apparently, you assume but you do not know that the Federal Reserve Board would choose a figure in the area of 5 percent for time deposits

under \$100,000. Let me call your attention to Chairman Martin's testimony before the House Committee last June 16 when he said, "The 5 percent ceiling, as of last month, would have had only a moderate overall effect in curbing banks' ability to compete for savings in small denominations. Only about 190 banks were offering rates in May exceeding 5 percent on consumer-type time deposits." That the situation has not materially changed in this regard is evidenced by Vice Chairman Robertson's statement before the Senate Committee the same day that Mr. Barr testified—August 4. He said, "In contrast to the 5 1/2 percent rate on money market CD's, available evidence indicates that relatively few banks are paying more than 5 percent on other time deposits."

So, even if the Federal Reserve would do what you have no assurance they will do, the impact would be minimal and would certainly fail to relieve the terrible shortage of mortgage funds which worsens day by day. Furthermore, if the Federal Reserve Board were really sincere in taking meaningful action to end the rate war and helping the housing situation, they would have used their present authority to increase the minimum maturity on time deposits from the present 30 days up to at least 90 days or six months. Governor Robertson's testimony was exceedingly clear on this point, giving it his strongest personal recommendations. Yet, the Federal Reserve Board has refused to take this action which even the American Bankers Association has endorsed.

I fail to see the source of your great confidence that the Federal Reserve Board can be depended upon to take voluntary action to correct the mistake they made last December when they even refuse to admit that they made a mistake in the first place.

I also would ask you whether in your official position as Secretary of the Treasury you support Mr. Barr's statement that "the fact that the Federal Reserve Board has permitted 5 1/2 percent on these large, very rate sensitive CD's has contributed favorably to our balance of payments position this year." This seems to be an endorsement by the Treasury Department of the now discredited "Operation Twist". For example, Governor Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board, who is taking a leading role in the administration's balance of payments efforts, had this to say about the fallacy of artificially high short-term interest rates as a balance of payments weapon:

"Congressman Tonn. I would appreciate some statement from the Board as to what errors may be contained in this paper because it indicates that Operation Twist increases the balance of payments by only \$154 million and obviously this is not enough to be worthwhile. It means that Operation Twist was ill conceived."

"Mr. ROBERTSON. It was, and that ought to be an answer to your paper."

If there is a disagreement, as it appears to be, perhaps the Banking and Currency Committee should hold hearings on this question to consider the differing views. On the other hand, if the Treasury Department is in agreement with Governor Robertson's statement, then I would hope that you would see fit to correct the misleading inference from Mr. Barr's testimony last week that Operation Twist is still official government policy. In any case, your Under Secretary must certainly be aware that Congress has by law specifically exempt foreign official time deposits from the "Regulation Q" ceilings. (76 Stat. 953) Mr. Barr somehow failed to mention this crucial point. I might add that one of the last official positions taken by former Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon—a Republican, as you recall—was to criticize strongly the use of high, short-term interest rates as a balance of payments weapon. Mr. Dillon said that such a policy would merely be self-defeating. I would

August 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18033

report last week that the Government of Thailand is making an effort to combine with the other nonbelligerent nations of Asia to end the Vietnamese war. The Thai Government points out that Vietnam is an Asian problem that most fittingly lends itself to solution by Asians. With this contention, I am in total agreement. The Asian nations, meeting together, can be expected to make powerful and persuasive recommendations in behalf of a settlement. I believe the Governments of the Philippines, Malaysia, Japan, Indonesia, and several other countries have already shown some interest in the wise and foresighted Thai proposal.

I have written to the Secretary of State to urge that he offer very possible incentive to these Asian states to find a fair solution in Vietnam. I asked him to communicate our sympathy to them. I asked him further to say that we would welcome their mediation ideas. I called upon him to make clear that we do not consider our national interest in conflict with theirs.

I note with satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, that since I sent my letter to the Secretary, Mr. MANSFIELD, the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, has expressed similar sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the Secretary of State to make clear to the nations of Asia that we would be pleased to withdraw our troops from Vietnam in favor of having Asian forces patrol a peace settlement. I can foresee, for instance, the strengthening of the forces in the buffer zone between North and South Vietnam. I would also approve of extending that buffer zone into the area between Vietnam and its neighbors, Laos and Cambodia. Asian troops in this land would, I believe, be far more effective in keeping the peace than troops from the Western countries.

One might also predict, Mr. Speaker, that Asians would be far more sensitive, given their community of experience, to the needs and desires of the Vietnamese people than westerners can be. We who have watched the Vietnamese war are conscious of the many errors our Government, often in total good will, has made through lack of understanding. The injection of Asians into the effort to make peace may be a key to a solution that would appear fair to both sides. The Thai Government suggests that, for symbolic reasons, the next peace conference ought not to be in Geneva, but in Bangkok or Jakarta. I agree with that position, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, I might note in the Thai proposals the opportunity to welcome back Indonesia into the family of nations. By its own choice, Indonesia has been a hermit state, in the diplomatic sense, for some time. But recent events in Indonesia have charged the situation completely. It is time for the world to welcome Indonesia back to the constructive work that it can do as an energetic and populous nation. This could be a satisfying corollary to the Thai plan.

Mr. Speaker, the countries of Asia of which I speak want neither Communist nor American dominance in their affairs. They know that their welfare depends, above all, on stability in the Pacific area.

In my view, ours does too. I believe we would be wise to put our confidence in the Asian nations who show an interest in acting as intermediaries for a peace settlement. I am grieved than an end to the war now seems so distant. I regard the Thai initiative as a most hopeful sign, which our Government should do its utmost to support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The text of my letter of August 5 to Secretary Rusk follows:

AUGUST 5, 1966.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
The Secretary of State,
The Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I find the information very encouraging that the government of Thailand has undertaken initiative to involve other nations of Asia in a Vietnam settlement. I believe it is quite appropriate for Asian countries to look upon the Vietnam dispute as essentially an Asian matter. Their interest in resolving the matter is extremely gratifying.

I would like to urge you to give every incentive to these Asian states, led by Thailand, to find a fair solution to the war in Vietnam. I suggest that our sympathy for their objectives be communicated to them. I would go farther and say that we would welcome their mediation proposals. I believe it should be made clear that we do not consider our national interest in conflict with theirs.

I foresee, as another advantage to the Thai proposals, an opportunity to welcome back Indonesia into the family of responsible nations. Indonesia's participation in peace-making activities would lend substantial weight to any program put forth.

I think we should make it particularly clear that we would favor a substitution of Asian forces for our own to patrol any peace settlement that is reached. I believe it would be very salutary if some means could be found to extend the buffer zone not only between south and North Vietnam but also between Vietnam and its neighbors. I would be anxious to have Asians in the buffer zone between North and South Vietnam and along the Laotian and Cambodian borders. Such troops would be more influential than ours, I believe, in safeguarding the stability of a settlement.

Most important, I believe we must put our confidence in the Asian nations who show an interest in acting as intermediaries for a peace settlement. They know that their own welfare depends, in large measure, on stability in the Pacific area. They want neither American nor Communist domination. I believe they would be sensitive to the desires of the Vietnamese people. I regard the Thai initiative as a most hopeful sign, which our Government should do its utmost to support.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

HEALTH EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the event Members have not seen it, I recommend that you read the article published in the May issue of Today's Health entitled "What Our Kids Don't Know About Health." I believe you will be as amazed as I was to learn how many misconceptions the average schoolchild has in relation to his own health and well being. This situation exists despite the

fact that during the past three sessions, Congress has enacted 20 landmark measures in health and 19 in education. Appropriations for health programs have doubled and the budget for the Office of Education has been increased more than fivefold.

Major achievements in the health field include the medicare program; increased health services to domestic migrant agricultural workers; expanded maternal and child health and crippled children's programs; 32 new clinics for retarded children; construction assistance for 1,300 hospital and health facilities to add more than 56,000 new hospital beds; financial support for more than 16,000 medical research projects and advanced training for 25,000 scientists; construction starts for 62 institutions to enroll more than 2,400 additional students each year for training in the health professions.

Equally impressive are the accomplishments in education, including funds to improve educational opportunities for nearly 7½ million underprivileged children in 20,000 school districts; summer Headstart programs for 560,000 preschool children in 13,350 community education projects and year-round programs for 120,000 children; textbooks and other learning materials for more than 40 million children in every State; college work-study programs for more than 110,000 needy college students; and construction aid for 1,300 institutions of higher learning—including new classrooms, laboratories, and libraries.

All these are testimony to the fact that this Nation is becoming increasingly conscious of the advantages of good health and education. The thing that concerns me, however, and it should concern you, is the fact that the results of the money spent in health research are not being taught with the money allocated to education in practical, everyday language—capable of daily application. Children need to know about personal health practices such as care of eyes, ears, and teeth. They need an understanding of community health agencies and the services they provide related to health care, air and water pollution, sanitation, fluoridation of water, and similar services. With television commercials depicting cigarette smoking, the drinking of some particular brand of beer, the purchase of brand X cosmetic as assurance that it will make one more attractive, there is a great need for students to know the basic facts about smoking, drinking, grooming nostrums—all those items we are repeatedly urged to buy.

There has been great misunderstanding about just what constitutes health education. It has been combined with physical education instruction on some occasions and taught by coaches whose primary interest is producing winning ball teams or by teachers trained to teach English or home economics or whatever. I strongly favor winning ball teams and good English, but let us not lose sight of both objectives. Qualified health educators should be placed in schools to teach health education as an academic subject requiring the same instructional materials and facilities as

18034

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 10, 1966

those provided for other academic subjects.

Many of us saw and probably took the national health test which was telecast by the Columbia Broadcasting System. You must have shared my shock at the inferior level of understanding which was revealed. More than one-half the participating audience failed this elementary test of health knowledge. This confirms what the experts tell us—parents are no more equipped to teach children necessary health concepts than to teach them math or science. And our present methods of school instruction is no better.

Very pertinent to this problem was the school health education study, guided by an outstanding committee of physicians, educators, public health personnel, and school administrators, who conducted a nationwide study which included over 18,000 students in grades 6, 9, and 12 who were tested to determine what they know and do about their health. This study, housed in the National Education Association, determined where health education is taught, how it is organized and scheduled, who teaches it, how it is taught, who receives the instruction, what areas of health are emphasized, and what are the major problems confronting administrators. Glaring weaknesses and deficiencies were revealed in the areas of alcohol education, community health programs, consumer health education, environmental hazards, health careers, international health activities, nutrition and weight control, family life, smoking, venereal disease education, and others. The cause for these deficiencies was found to stem from grossly inadequate school instruction, including, first, lack of support for and understanding of the value of health education; second, inadequate time for instruction and failure to use time provided effectively; third, a lack of qualified personnel assigned to health instruction; fourth, a lack of progression in what is taught; fifth, repetition on some health topics and complete neglect of others; sixth, a need for local and State supervisory and consultant services; and seventh, a lack of teaching materials and facilities that are provided in other subject areas.

This study revealed that financial support is urgently needed for: first, instructional equipment, library and other materials; second, advanced study institutes for teachers and supervisors in service; and third, traineeships to meet the critical demand for qualified personnel in colleges and universities that prepare teachers.

All three of these immediate needs can be provided for by modification of existing legislation. The first two would be covered by the National Defense Education Act if titles III and XI were extended to include health education.

My first bill would make it possible for elementary and secondary schools, under title III of the National Defense Education Act, to acquire laboratory and other equipment necessary to train our schoolchildren in a modern fashion about the health problems which they encounter daily. It would help bring the teaching of health from the horse

and buggy days to the jet age in which we live. The amendment to title XI would furnish support for teacher training institutes conducted in our institutions of higher education to improve the qualifications of persons who are or will engage in teaching health education or in the supervising or training of teachers of health education. There are a number of colleges and universities throughout the country which offer specialized training in health education both on the undergraduate and graduate levels. There are, in fact, 48 which offer a bachelor's program, 50 which offer a master's program, and 26 which offer a program at the doctoral level.

My second bill would amend section 306 of the Public Health Service Act to make it perfectly clear that the traineeships for professional public health personnel authorized under this section would be available to individuals who wish to increase their competence in the teaching of health education. I am informed that the present interpretation of section 306 has been such as to deny these persons receiving traineeships at institutions of learning which provide specialized training in public health and school health education.

Amendments to the two acts would provide tremendous impetus and support to school and college health programs and could have a significant impact on health instruction.

In essence, what is needed, and what I urge, is a national commitment to health education from the first school years throughout the span of a person's life. To help solve this problem, I am introducing today two bills to strengthen the health education programs of the schools of this Nation which, when enacted, will dramatically enhance the opportunity for our children to know the facts about their own health and better prepare them to make future decisions in their own best interests.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor, along with the Congressman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], two bills which will materially improve the teaching of health in the elementary and secondary schools of this country. During the course of the past number of years, our Appropriations Subcommittee has heard countless hours of testimony relative to both the health programs and the education programs of this Nation. I have always been concerned somewhat by the fact that there has not seemed to be any effective tying together of these two programs. We have appropriated large sums of money for medical research and health programs. We have appropriated large sums of money to support the educational programs of the elementary and secondary and schools of higher learning in this Nation.

I was just as appalled, as was the gentleman from Rhode Island, and as I am sure were the other Members of this House, by the tragically poor score that was the result of the CBS national health test. As I have thought seriously about this problem, I am more and more

forced to the conclusion that perhaps, to some degree at least, we have gotten the cart before the horse. It is awfully difficult to expect people to know something that they have never learned.

Now, I want to make it perfectly clear to Members of the House precisely what we are talking about. We are talking about instructions in health. We are not talking about physical fitness. We are not talking about physical education. We are talking about the better instructing of children in our elementary and secondary school systems about the true facts as they relate to their own personal health and to their community's health. There are many number of examples of what I am speaking about, but let me cite just one. Studies show that our young people are beginning the habit of cigarette smoking at an increasingly early age. The reason for this trend is not known, although there is much speculation about it. But I believe that it would be in the best interests of everyone if children were taught and could understand early in life what it means to them to acquire what for many is a lifelong habit.

The bills which we are introducing today would do three things, and I would like to explain exactly what is intended. First of all, title III of the National Defense Educational Assistance Act would be amended so that equipment needed for the modern-day teaching of health education would be available in the elementary and secondary schools. Now the kinds of equipment to which I refer would include audiovisual materials such as films, filmstrips, slides, recordings, posters, charts, vision and hearing testing equipment, displays, and videotapes for closed-circuit television. It would also include simple laboratory for practical experiments where certain essential foods are denied in the diet. These would provide a visual experience for schoolchildren and bring to them very graphically the precise need for a balanced diet and well-rounded nutritional habits.

Second, the bill would amend title XI of the National Defense Educational Assistance Act so that institutions of higher learning could conduct short-term courses and institutes whereby teachers in our school systems could be trained in the modern techniques of teaching health education and be brought up to date on the latest scientific knowledge as it relates to health and the health of schoolchildren. This would also afford an opportunity for the programming of health teaching in schools so that some items are not repeated and others omitted completely. Please bear in mind that the curriculums of these schools now include teaching in health practices or health habits and health education, but this is done in a most haphazard fashion. A recent study of school health education, referred to by the gentleman from Rhode Island, points out the fact that inadequate time for instruction, the lack of qualified teaching personnel, and a lack of progression in what is taught with a repetition of some topics and the neglect of others is contributing to the presently extremely deficient sit-

18098

Sec. 3. Payments made pursuant to part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (as added by the first section of this Act) shall, for purposes of section 103(c) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, be regarded as payments made under part A of such title XVIII.

Sec. 4. The amendments made by the preceding provisions of this Act are repealed effective July 1, 1968.

ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS FOR CUBAN REFUGEES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and permit the adjustment of status of Cuban refugees in the United States.

My bill eliminates the technical requirement which requires aliens such as Cuban refugees to leave this country and reenter in order to become eligible for permanent residence and eventual citizenship. I do not question this requirement for aliens who come to our country through normal procedure and in casual circumstances, and then elect to have their status adjusted to that of permanent resident. I believe, however, the requirement has little justification in the case of refugees from Cuba. Their entry into this country is anything but normal and casual—they are under duress and fleeing oppression.

I should point out the bill I am introducing today would make retroactive the refugee's application for adjustment of status, to the time of his last entry into the United States. This is just and equitable.

The talents of many Cuban refugees are going to waste because State professional licensing laws keep those without permanent residence status from practicing their skills and professions. This situation, and the expensive and laborious procedure to obtain this status under present law, is keeping refugees in various difficult circumstances, which do not befit our humanitarian traditions.

I am thinking of examples all over our country, where, because of their immigration status, qualified Cubans have been unable to teach Spanish in the local schools.

I am thinking of similar problems involving Cuban doctors, dentists, nurses, lawyers, skilled workers, and others. It is obvious that such refugees could fill an urgent need in our society if given the opportunity for adjustment of status.

Moreover, the parole status of many Cuban refugees has inhibited the rather substantial Federal program of assistance administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The purpose of this program is to give effective asylum by providing the refugees with opportunities for self-support. Approximately \$42 million in Federal funds were spent in the last fiscal year in the Cuban refugee program. The figure for the current fiscal year will approach \$51 million, and officials in the executive branch have indicated a rise in that amount can be anticipated for fiscal year 1968.

These sizable amounts indicate clearly the importance that these funds be directed toward making the refugees self-

sufficient, so that we can anticipate a decline in expenditures in future years. The bill I offer today will be extremely helpful in this matter.

I would also hope, Mr. President, that legislative action on adjusting the status of Cuban refugees would encourage the resettlement of some refugees to other countries in this hemisphere, where refugee talent would contribute to economic, political, and social development. Today, however, refugees are hesitant to leave the United States. Under their present immigration status as parolees, they are not assured of reentry if, for valid reasons, they choose to return. My bill will help to remedy this situation.

Mr. President, for some time I have been very much concerned with the problem I have outlined today, and as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, have conducted a number of hearings in Washington and elsewhere which dramatically document the need for the legislation which I have proposed today. Recently, on July 14, Secretary of State Dean Rusk in response to questions before the subcommittee on refugees said he placed a "high priority" on legislation to adjust the status of Cuban refugees, and he strongly urged the Congress to take action in this important matter. Legislation is also supported by the Departments of Justice, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The adjustment of status for Cuban refugees has been pending in the Senate since February 1962, when our very able and distinguished colleague and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees, Senator HART, first introduced a bill for this purpose. And I want to pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan for his leadership in this area. The Senate, in fact, provided for the adjustment of status for Cuban refugees in the general immigration bill passed during the last session. Unfortunately, this provision was deleted at the last minute in Congress. I am delighted to note that hearings on this subject are being held in the other body.

As Senators know, the record in the Senate is rather extensive on this matter. In order to consider the bill which I introduced today, and another related bill, of which I am a cosponsor, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, has scheduled a public hearing to be held on Tuesday morning August 16. The witnesses will include officials from the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a representative from the American Council of Voluntary Agencies.

Legislative action adjusting the status of Cuban refugees in the United States is long overdue, and I hope the Senate will quickly reaffirm its consensus of 1965 on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3712) to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE A COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH INFORMATION ON FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to study and investigate the feasibility and design of an information system which would enable States and localities to participate more effectively in federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs.

The relationship between the Federal Government and State and local governments is an increasing paradox: As more and more Federal programs become available, State and local governments become less and less able to sort them out and decide which ones could help them most. The Federal programs are beneficial; the State and local governments want to benefit from them. But the very proliferation of Federal programs is bewildering to the local communities for which they are designed. And this bewilderment is working against the creative federalism which President Johnson spoke of 2 years ago in a historic speech at Ann Arbor, Mich.: A federalism based on local initiative, Federal support, and close cooperation between Washington and city hall.

No one in this Chamber knows more about the problems of making creative federalism work than the distinguished junior Senator from Maine. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Senator MUSKIE has dedicated his energies to finding ways by which we can strengthen the cooperative basis of our Federal system.

The 3-year study recently completed by his subcommittee makes clear the benefits of creative federalism, and it also makes clear the problems which are raised by confusion and a lack of coordination between levels of government. Senator MUSKIE has introduced a host of extremely constructive legislative proposals to overcome these problems.

The legislation I introduce today supplements his efforts and the efforts of others to build efficiency into Government. It is directed at one very important part of the overall problem—the need to build an effective communications system between local, State and Federal levels of government.

We are all aware of the dramatic rise in the demands on State and local governments. This rise reflects increased public needs and responsibilities which have been shouldered by local officials. And there is every indication that these needs will grow because of the innumerable problems associated with urbanization, economic expansion, and population growth.

August 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18097

participating under the program provided under such part A; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 3710. A bill for the relief of Chief Petty Officer James G. Dole, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3711. A bill to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 3712. A bill to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to authorize a study and investigation of an information service system for States and localities designed to enable such States and localities to more effectively participate in federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XVIII OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN HOSPITAL INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT SERVICES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the basic purpose of medicare is to pay the hospital bills of older people. But, as matters now stand, many older Americans, through no fault of their own, will not have those hospital bills paid. They will not have those bills paid because of the fact that their local hospital does not participate in the medicare plan. That hospital may very well be the only medical institution in an area of many miles.

These nonparticipating hospitals are staying out of medicare for a variety of reasons. They may not be able to meet the standards of quality of care required, or they may be unwilling or unable to comply with the title VI requirements of the Civil Rights Act.

The key point which has been completely overlooked in all of this hoopla is that the older person—of whatever race—is the one who suffers most in this situation. The hospital has a choice as to whether it wants to participate. The older individual, however, has no choice in the matter. He does not pick his hospital. He goes to the hospital with which his doctor is affiliated. The doctor chooses the time and place of treatment—not the sick old person.

When his doctor happens to be on the medical staff of a hospital which is not participating in medicare, the older person has just two equally unfair choices. In order to get his care paid for, he can abandon the doctor who may have cared for him for 20, 30, or even 40 years and try to find a new physician on the staff

of a participating hospital. In this case, a longstanding relationship of trust and understanding must go down the drain so that dollars can change hands in accordance with regulations. The alternative to this sacrifice for the sick old man is for him to just dig down deep and pay for care out of his own pocket.

Those are tragic and terrible choices to force upon sick, helpless, older Americans. Medicare was supposed to relieve the "financial nightmare" of illness—and not to substitute one bad dream for another.

Now, I can understand that the administration wants these hospitals to meet all of its tests and standards. But the primary obligation of medicare is to the older people of this country—all of the older people of this country. The Congress intended that every single older person who needed hospital care would get that care paid for—at least in large part. Of course, I do not think we intended to pay for care in a substandard hospital—substandard in the sense that it did not meet proper medical standards. But, any refusal to pay for necessary care—other than that in medically substandard institutions—reneges on our promise to 19 million aged Americans.

Mr. President, the bill which I now introduce, for appropriate reference, is specifically designed to help fulfill that congressional promise to our fine older people.

My bill would pay directly to the older medicare beneficiary 75 percent of the reasonable charges for his treatment in a hospital which is not participating in the medicare program. In order to assure that the care was provided in a hospital meeting proper medical standards, payments would be made only if the treatment were in a hospital accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals or the American Osteopathic Association.

This benefit, effective as of July 1, 1966, would be available until July 1, 1968, so as to provide a reasonable transitional period during which many hospitals might make the adjustments and decisions necessary to permit them to participate in the medicare program. The Congress could reevaluate the situation in 1968, when the benefit would expire.

The reason for selecting 75 percent as the basis for reimbursement was to offer significant assistance to the aged—but in an amount not great enough to offer hospitals a financial incentive to continue to stay out of the medicare program.

Benefits available under this transitional provision would essentially be subject to the standard medicare limitations on days of care authorized, kinds of services for which payment might be made, etc. The overall limitations would apply regardless of whether care was provided in participating or nonparticipating hospitals.

Mr. President, the proposal I offer is not intended to serve as a means of enabling hospitals to evade the Civil Rights Act or any other legislation which may or may not apply to medicare. I want to assure Members of the Senate that my intention in developing this bill was not

to introduce clever and artistic legislative loopholes into medicare.

What I want to see to, Mr. President, is that every older American who needs and receives hospital care will have that care paid for in accordance with the U.S. Government's commitment. Let us honor and fulfill our promise. And that promise was made to people—not hospitals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this will be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3709) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and related provisions of other acts to permit individuals insured for benefits under part A of such title to receive, for a limited period, certain payments with respect to inpatient hospital services and outpatient hospital diagnostic services furnished to them by certain hospitals not participating under the program provided under such part A, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3709

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART C—TEMPORARY PROVISIONS FOR SPECIAL INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN SERVICES PROVIDED BY CERTAIN HOSPITALS NOT PARTICIPATING UNDER PART A

"ENTITLEMENT; BENEFITS

"SEC. 1891. Any individual who, prior to July 1, 1968, receives inpatient hospital services, or outpatient hospital diagnostic services with respect to which—

"(1) he is not entitled to hospital insurance benefits provided under part A, and

"(2) he would have been entitled to hospital insurance benefits provided under part A, if the hospital furnishing such services (whether directly or under arrangements, as defined in section 1861(w), with it) had, at the time such services were furnished, had an agreement in effect under this title,

shall be entitled to receive a money payment, with respect to such services, equal to 75 per centum of the amount of the actual and reasonable charge imposed by such hospital for such services, if the hospital furnishing such services (whether directly or under such arrangements with it) is accredited as a hospital by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals or the American Osteopathic Association.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 1892. Payments to which individuals are entitled under section 1891 shall be paid upon application therefor to the Secretary (submitted in such form and manner, and containing such information as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe), and shall be paid by the Secretary from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office."

SEC. 2. Section 1861(e) of the Social Security Act is amended, in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), by inserting "section 1891," after "section 1814(d)."

lated in the American way of life within one generation.

However, I can briefly note that the Order of AHEPA has provided the type of leadership that has given great incentive to the Greek immigrant and his family that has brought forth outstanding businessmen, labor leaders, professional men, educators, churchmen, artists, writers, and leading figures in public life. George Christopher, former mayor of San Francisco, came to America as a Greek immigrant boy and Congressman JOHN BRADEMAs is the son of a Greek immigrant. Christopher is a Republican and BRADEMAs is a Democrat. I say this is an excellent example of the Greek immigrant becoming fully assimilated in the American way of life.

The Order of AHEPA with other national Greek-American organizations in the early twenties helped to build church communities throughout the United States. AHEPA provided millions of dollars in scholarships to aid young men and women to gain a college education; urged its members and fellow Greek-Americans to become active in public affairs and public office; exercised its constitutional right of petition in urging Congress to amend the various immigration acts and special acts to aid immigrants from all foreign nations to come to America, to grant to Eastern-Greek-Orthodox faith a major religious faith status in the United States; and most important, urged the Americans of Hellenic lineage to become outstanding American citizens while at the same time preserving the great Hellenic heritage that gave so much to the world and America.

Mr. President, I know that the delegates to the AHEPA convention will give serious consideration to both domestic and international problems that will come within the expertise of the convention's special committees and have these views made known to their representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, for the information of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some of the basic facts concerning the Order of AHEPA.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Founded July 26, 1922 in Atlanta, Georgia. Local chapters: Order of AHEPA, 459 Chapters. Daughters of Penelope, 345 Chapters. Sons of Pericles, 165 Chapters. Maids of Athena, 156 Chapters. The AHEPA family (Order of Ahepa and its three Auxiliaries) have a total of 1,125 Local Chapters.

Objects, purposes of the AHEPA: The Objects and Purposes of the Order of Ahepa are: (a) To promote and encourage loyalty of its members to the country of which they are citizens (b) To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government (c) To instill a due appreciation of the privileges of Citizenship (d) To encourage interest and active participation in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor (e) To pledge its members to oppose political corruption and tyranny (f) To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture (g) To promote good fellowship,

and endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness to their fellow man (h) To endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense (i) To promote Education and maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

AHEPA's contributions to worthy and charitable causes:

The Order of Ahepa has contributed financially to many worthy causes during its 44 years of existence. These contributions do not take into account the many local activities of our Chapters within the realm of their local communities. Local Chapters of the Ahepa Family have always given generously and vigorously supported local community projects in the fields of education, charity and civic improvement. The national and international projects and contributions include:

1. Relief of Florida hurricane victims.
2. Relief of Mississippi flood victims.
3. Relief of Corinth, Greece earthquake victims.
4. Relief for the War Orphans of Greece.
5. Relief of Dodecanese Islands (Greece) earthquake victims.
6. Funds for the Hellenic Museum in Greece.
7. Local, national and international scholarships for needy and worthy students.
8. Relief for the fatherless children of Refugees, through the Near East Relief.
9. Support of the Greek Orthodox Seminaries (Theological) at Pomfret, Conn., and Brookline, Mass.
10. Erection of the Ahepa Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial at Hyde Park, New York.
11. Erection of the Ypsilanti Memorial at Ypsilanti, Mich.
12. Erection of the Dilboy Memorial.
13. Relief of Turkish earthquake victims.
14. Funds for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate at Jerusalem.
15. Funds for the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate at Constantinople.
16. Ecuadorean Relief.
17. Kansas City flood relief.
18. Greek war Relief Program during and after World War II.
19. Construction of Ahepa Hospitals in Athens and Salonika, Greece following World War II.
20. Construction of 7 Ahepa Health Centers in Greece following World War II.
21. Ahepa Agricultural College in Greece.
22. Ionian Islands (Greece) earthquake relief.
23. Ahepa Preventorium in Volos, Greece.
24. Daughters of Penelope Girls' Shelter Home in Athens, Greece.
25. Construction of Ahepa Hall for Boys at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, New York.
26. Construction of Ahepa School at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, New York.
27. Sale of 500 Million Dollars in U.S. War Bonds during World War II as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury Department.
28. Contributions to the Truman Library, Independence, Mo.
29. Contributions to the Dr. George Papanicolaou Research Cancer Institute, Miami, Florida.
30. Erection of the Ahepa Truman Statue and Plaza in Athens, Greece.
31. Donation of 40,000 American and Canadian books to schools and libraries in Greece.
32. Ahepa Medals for Scholastic Excellence for studies in the Greece Language to students.
33. Presentations of 7-volume sets of the Greek Classics to schools and libraries in the U.S. and Canada.
34. CARE Tool Kits for students of vocational schools in Greece.

35. Ahepa Refugee Relief Committee, to aid war refugees of World War II.

36. Sports Kits for Greek school children.

Citizenship: Ahepa's requirements stipulate that members must be American or Canadian citizens, or have indicated their intention to become citizens in which case the fraternity assists the new member in attaining citizenship. Ahepa Chapters assist newly-arrived non-citizens in attaining their full American and Canadian citizenship, and also instruct their members with the obligations that go hand-in-hand with citizenship.

Civic participation: The local Chapters of the Ahepa and its Auxiliaries are active in their own civic affairs and projects, all of which conforms to the fraternity's program of urging its members to be model citizens through planned civic activity. These Chapters are active in aiding and contributing to local fund drives.

International relations: In the field of International Relations, the Order of Ahepa has constantly maintained an active interest in affairs aimed at further cementing the good-will and friendship between the peoples of Canada, the United States, and Greece, as noted in the heading of this Fact Sheet "Ahepa's Contributions to Worthy Causes." The fraternity takes an active part in America's "People-to-People" program which seeks a closer and more harmonious relationship between the peoples of the United States and other countries. Active roles have been taken by the Ahepa and its officials in several matters of international importance concerning the United States and Greece.

MANSFIELD ON ASIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one of the reasons I am so proud to be a Marylander is the Baltimore Sun, which is one of the leading daily newspapers in the United States.

It was a matter of great interest to me, therefore, to read a Sun editorial this morning entitled "Mansfield on Asia." The editorial praised the proposal of the distinguished majority leader for an all-Asia conference on the Vietnam problem.

As the editorial points out, the opinions of the Senator from Montana are "as valuable as any in this country." I believe that Senator MANSFIELD's long expertise in Asian affairs is a valuable asset to this body. I am glad that the Baltimore Sun has paid tribute to this expertise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun,
Aug. 10, 1966]

MANSFIELD ON ASIA

Peking's scornful rejection of proposals for an all-Asia peace conference, with Hanoi's rejection immediately following, does not mean that the idea must be abandoned. No one knows what form any discussions leading toward peace in Vietnam, when discussions finally come, are going to take. An Asian conference is surely one possible form, and it may be the likeliest. Among those who believe so, and have believed so for some time, is Senator MANSFIELD, whose opinions on Asian affairs are as valuable as any in this country.

For a good while Senator MANSFIELD has been urging a greater Asian initiative in the

solution of Asian problems, including first of all the conflict in Vietnam. It is in line with this that he welcomes the conference proposal put forward by Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia. Last spring he himself suggested that Burma or Japan try to arrange such a gathering. Who arranges it does not matter, if it can be arranged, nor does the place of meeting matter. The site need not be Geneva: perhaps better somewhere else. Mr. MANSFIELD says, "Let it be called in Rangoon or Bangkok, in Manila or Phnom Penh, or, for that matter, even in Peking."

Of course no conference in Peking, or elsewhere, is immediately in prospect. The point is to keep the idea of an Asian solution open, in the air, so that if this turns out to be the way to peace we will be ready for it.

HOSPITALIZATION OF SENATOR BENNETT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] has been hospitalized at the Bethesda Naval Hospital since July 30, when a bleeding ulcer developed in his stomach.

I am happy to report to the Senate today that my colleague is making a rapid recovery. His physicians were able to stop the bleeding within a few days after admitting the Senator to the hospital. He has been on a typical ulcer diet for several days. I have been told that he now feels quite well.

In cases like this, I understand, physicians like to keep their patients hospitalized until full recovery is evident. On this basis, the Senator will be in the hospital until the end of next week.

The ulcer has been described as quite small. In fact, it barely showed up on X-rays taken at the time he was admitted to the hospital.

I am sure that the Senate joins with me in prayers that the Senator's strength may be renewed so that he may return to his duties in the Senate on schedule.

RULES COMMITTEE BEGINS HEARINGS ON SCHOOL MILK BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am delighted to be able to report to my Senate colleagues that the House Rules Committee opened hearings this morning on legislation that would, among other things, extend the special milk program for schoolchildren for an additional 4 years. This legislation, H.R. 13361, was reported from the House Agriculture Committee on July 29. It is similar to the Ellender child nutrition legislation passed by the Senate almost 1 month ago. A revised version of the Senate bill, S. 3467, was recently reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

The Rules Committee has not as yet heard all of those who wish to testify on H.R. 13361. Certain jurisdictional problems are created by the fact that the bill reported by the House Education and Labor Committee is quite similar. However, I am hopeful that the Rules Committee will meet again this week to receive testimony from the two or three remaining House Members who wish to make statements on the bill. I further hope that the Rules Committee will soon schedule the bill for floor action.

Early passage is essential if the school administrators around the country are to be able to act with any certainty on school budgets for the year to come. Without quick action these administrators will be uncertain as to whether the Federal Government is going to continue to commit itself to paying part of the costs of midmorning and midafternoon milk breaks.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S TRIBUTE TO ISRAEL'S PRESIDENT SHAZAR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it was my honor on August 1 to attend a dinner sponsored by the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York in honor of President Shazar, of Israel, at the Hotel Plaza, in New York. At this dinner, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, delivered an eloquent tribute to President Shazar, to which I invite the attention of Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Rockefeller's address be printed at this point preceded by an introduction of Governor Rockefeller by Max Fisher of Michigan, national chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.

There being no objection, the introduction and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER AT UJA DINNER HONORING PRESIDENT SHAZAR, AUGUST 1, 1966

Mr. MAX FISHER. The American Jewish community established UJA not only out of a sense of Jewish responsibility but also because it was concerned with the basic right of every man to be safe and free. Because of this humanitarian concern, Americans of every faith give their support to the United Jewish Appeal. Our next speaker is one such American.

Twenty years ago, one million and a half survivors of the Nazi massacres in Europe hovered on the brink of extinction. Right here in New York it was Nelson Rockefeller who took action to demonstrate that those homeless Jews had an urgent claim on the compassion of Americans, whatever their religion. Nelson Rockefeller founded the Non-Sectarian Community Committee for the United Jewish Appeal and became its first chairman. He played a significant role in helping UJA in its first \$100 million campaign in 1946.

Much has changed since that dark time. Those who were wasting away in the DP camps have found homes and new lives in lands of freedom. But one thing has not changed. Governor Nelson Rockefeller is still eminently concerned with UJA's humanitarian work. He still serves with distinction as honorary chairman of the Non-Sectarian Community Committee of the UJA of Greater New York. He is with us this evening to express officially the greetings of the people of this state to our guest of honor.

Ladies and gentlemen, Governor Nelson Rockefeller.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE DINNER HONORING PRESIDENT SHAZAR OF ISRAEL, UNITED JEWISH APPEAL OF GREATER NEW YORK, NEW YORK, N.Y., AUGUST 1, 1966

On behalf of the people of the State of New York, I bid you welcome, Mr. President—Shalom, Hanassi. We welcome you as a distinguished scholar and gifted writer;

we welcome you as a revered philosopher; and, most of all, we welcome you as the leader of a young, vigorous and vibrant democracy that has captured the American imagination and won the American heart. I am also delighted to welcome Mrs. Shazar to our shores—for she is a remarkable woman, a true Israeli Halutz—a pioneer—and a fine author in her own right.

I'd like to point out, Mr. President, that you and I have a common responsibility. We are each accountable to about two and one-half million Jewish citizens. And our nations are joined by so many bonds of humanity, history and common experience.

In the last century, an impassioned American poet proclaimed the promise of America to the world:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses. . . ."

These words of Emma Lazarus are engraved for all time on our Statue of Liberty in the Port of New York. In this century, they could emblazon the ports of Haifa and Jaffa just as well.

Both of our nations—one of the world's oldest democracies and one of the world's youngest—have opened their arms wide to millions. As in the dreams of the Hebrew prophets, we have both been enriched by the gathering of the Exiles.

The more recent migration to Israel—still fresh in our minds—is one of the great, moving dramas of this age. Over a million people—a shattered remnant of the nightmare of Nazism—gathered at a small, barren and all-but-forsaken land. They came from over 70 nations. They took root alongside those who came before them. And just as in this country, the immigrant—by his sweat and by his toil, by his vision and by his creativity—helped to forge a new nation.

By these massive infusions of new blood, both our countries became half-brothers to the whole world—with something of almost every land to be found within us. In fact, long ago we almost became even closer.

One of my scholarly friends recently pointed out to me a fascinating footnote to American history. It seems that our Pilgrim forefathers seriously discussed making Hebrew the official tongue of the New World.

Other ties join us, but I want to mention just one more personal link between President Shazar and myself. Some years ago, Mr. Shazar had an able special assistant, a charming young Israeli woman by the name of Lea Ostrovsky Ben Boaz. On my own staff, I have an able Press Secretary in Leslie Slote. Today, the former Miss Ben Boaz is Mrs. Slote. All of which both Les and I regard as an extremely favorable U.S. balance of trade with Israel.

I would like to tell you of some thoughts I had when I received the kind invitation of the United Jewish Appeal to be here tonight. Two images flashed through my mind. The first was of the Israel we know today: a nation that made the Negev bloom . . . a nation that swiftly created great seats of learning—the Hebrew University, the new Tel Aviv University, the Weizmann Institute and the Technion . . . a nation throbbing with industrial activity and new agriculture . . . a nation of refuge and new hopes for humanity. Then my mind rushed back to a time two brief decades ago when all this was only a dream . . . and the only realities were tens of thousands of displaced Jews herded into the camps of Europe—and off in the distance a strange, untried land. The United Jewish Appeal played a heroic role in joining these people with that land.

I remember going to Eddie Warburg back in those days when he was the UJA chairman. I felt very deeply that the task of resettling this exodus of homeless Jews was a challenge and responsibility not only of the Jewish community but of free men of all faiths. Therefore, I asked him if he would permit me to organize a Non-Sectarian Community Committee for the New York United

August 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18123

and rant about the roadblocks that were thrown in his way in his attempt to become a minister. He was sputtering and almost exploding when Mays held up his hand and said, "Cool it, baby, I'm on your side."

The youngster quieted down and Willie said, "If you want to be a minister, you can be. Don't let anybody stop you. I never listened to anybody who told me I couldn't do something. If you do, you're defeated right away."

Mays added, "When I was 19—that's about how old you are now—I went zero for 24 with the Birmingham Giants. That was my first 24 times at bat, too. If I had listened to all the poor mouths who were giving me advice, I'd have quit baseball right then."

"It takes a great deal of hardship to be a minister and you have to keep trying. But if you want to be one, you'll keep on, trying and you'll fight and overcome."

Cool it, baby. I went zero for 24. That's the kind of talk the youngsters listen to, and they can feel with Willie, because he made it the hard way as a child in Alabama.

One can almost see the boys taking Willie's advice to heart. One youngster said he wanted to be a great athlete like Willie. Willie snapped back, "That's what you say. But you're smoking and you know you can't do that and be an athlete."

The UAW Solidarity article reminds us, too, that the job corpsmen need a lot of understanding.

An analysis of the first 10,000 enrollees accepted is enlightening, and it must be remembered that to get the project off to a good start, the first 10,000 many have been less disadvantaged than later members.

With a 17-year average age, most of the first 10,000 were more like 13-year-olds in size. Most had never slept between sheets, never shared a room with only one other. Some never had had electric lights. Nearly two-thirds lived in substandard housing. More than 60 per cent came from families in which the primary wage earner was unemployed.

The average corpsman had never completed ninth grade and could read no better than a fifth grader. Fewer than one in 10 had ever held a job.

We'll let Willie Mays close this editorial: "Kids today are no different than they were when I was a boy. They see television and they've got a right to dream. I was the biggest dreamer on our block. Then, when you're out of school a few years and you find you're drifting just like a lot of the older people, that's the time a kid says to himself: I gotta get out of this. Out!

"When a kid gets to that age—like these kids—when they say they gotta get out, that's when society has to let them in. This Job Corps is going to save these boys. They're going to make it. Without this chance, they were dead."

"These kids are my heroes."

PREMIER KY AND AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the August 1 issue of the Washington Evening Star contained two thoughtful appraisals of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's recent statements on the war in Vietnam. Because of the timeliness of these articles, entitled "Premier Ky Hits a Sensitive Nerve," written by Clayton Fritchey, and "Red China Riddle: Why Not Let It Grow Up?" written by Charles Bartlett, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PREMIER KY HITS A SENSITIVE NERVE

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Everybody, it seems, is now jumping on Premier Ky—publicly in Congress, privately in the administration—for spilling the beans on what a victory in Viet Nam is finally going to cost the United States. It hardly seems fair.

After all, the premier, like most generals, is a simple fellow politically, and all he has done is blurt out what seems to him to be the obvious truth about the situation in Viet Nam.

It may be embarrassing to the Johnson administration, and perhaps Ky should have consulted his Washington patrons before letting the cat out of the bag, but the American people at least owe him a debt of gratitude for telling them what they can't learn from their own government, mainly, the price of "victory" (whatever that is).

In recent weeks, the President has repeatedly assured the public that the United States is going to fight to the finish, that we are going to win, and that "success will be ours in Viet Nam."

It is a disturbing fact, however, that it has been impossible to wring from the President or any other administration spokesman just what is meant by "success," or just what American citizens are going to have to pay in the way of men and money to achieve it.

The favored thought has been, just leave it to Lyndon and all will be well. Skeptics are shushed by claims of battle successes in the field, and the assurance that the enemy can't take it much longer, especially the accelerated bombing.

But U.S. success stories do not seem to have spoiled Premier Ky, who is also an air marshal and thinks he knows something about war, particularly in Viet Nam where he has been fighting for so many years.

The premier already knows what Americans are soon going to learn, and that is that the air attacks on the Hanoi-Haiphong area are not producing results as predicted. They are not materially slowing down the enemy or breaking his morale. On the contrary, he is fighting harder than ever, as our own Marines can testify.

In fairness to Marshal Ky, it should be remembered that he has obligations to his own country as well as to ours. Apparently, he feels that the South Vietnamese should understand the realities of the present situation.

As Ky sees it, the United States must launch an all-out invasion of North Viet Nam to win the war. He can see that this would probably mean war with China, but he thinks "it's better to face them right now" rather than later.

The alternative to "destroying the Communists in their lair," he says, is for the United States to go on fighting a guerrilla war "for 5 to 10 years." He frankly doubts that the United States has the "patience" for this.

This is a shrewd appraisal, for Ky recognizes that U.S. public support for the war is already shaky. It has been momentarily bolstered by hopes that the stepped-up bombing might be effective, but when these hopes are dashed there will probably be another sag in the public opinion polls. What then?

The war already is costing us over \$2 billion a month. American casualties often exceed the South Vietnamese. Over 5 to 10 years, the cost would be \$100 billion to \$250 billion with casualties constantly mounting.

It is no wonder that Ky feels that Americans would not support such a prolonged stalemate. From his point of view, he is right in promoting an all-out attack. Even if it triggers a world war, what has he to lose? He knows that if the United States ever makes peace with North Viet Nam, it is the end for him and his fellow generals.

The State Department has decline direct

comment. A spokesman merely repeated that the United States "does not seek any wider war," which is undoubtedly true, at least at the moment. But what will the President do when pressure mounts again for breaking the stalemate?

Nobody knows, probably including the President himself.

RED CHINA RIDDLE: WHY NOT LET IT GROW UP?

(By Charles Bartlett)

Premier Ky and the U.S. Senate have injected practical and immediate considerations into the controversy on what should be done about Red China.

Ky's assertion that this is the time to deal with the Chinese Communists is a strident echo of President Kennedy's private expressions that the great decision of this decade would be whether or not to halt Red China's growth as a world menace by pre-emptive attack.

This question has been laid aside since Lyndon Johnson became president and American forces became involved in Viet Nam. Washington's great aim now is to avoid conflict with the Chinese and many strategies, including the invasion of North Viet Nam, have been subordinated to this objective. Even Air Force commanders no longer find time to urge bombing raids on mainland China.

Ky's proposal is motivated by a deepening awareness that Ho Chi Minh will probably not be permitted by Peking to give the orders that will end the guerrilla war. Washington recognizes this probability and is concentrating as a consequence upon making life so hard for the guerrillas themselves that they will eventually stop fighting without orders from Hanoi.

But Ky is in a cocky frame of mind. His military move against the Buddhists succeeded despite almost unanimous warnings from American officials that it was a fool-hardy step. He faces elections and he needs to demonstrate that he is not a puppet. He obviously hopes to rally support by stirring the nationalistic hatred of his people toward the Chinese.

The tin-horn militancy of Ky's recent interviews stands in weak contrast to the composure with which Ho Chi Minh last week rejected the offer by the Soviet Union and East European states to send volunteers. Ho is also afraid of the Red Chinese and he doesn't want to antagonize them by playing host to Soviet volunteers. So he rallies his people by telling them they are going to win the war with their own hands and with the "climate, snakes and mosquitoes" as their allies.

If Ho, who knows the Chinese well, doesn't trust them in their present mood and if the Russians, who also know them, find them irrationally dogmatic, why should the United States get involved with them? The Communists estimate that the Viet Cong and their families number only 800,000 of South Viet Nam's 17 million population. No major figure in the Johnson administration is attracted by the folly of tackling 800 million Chinese to suppress a rebellion of 800,000 Vietnamese.

The Senate reflected this nation's irresolution toward Red China in its vote to censure the consortium of European nations which plans to build a steel rolling mill in China. A majority of 56 senators voted for the censure and implicitly for the thesis that a thin and hungry Chinese is less dangerous than a fat one.

The moderately fattened Russian is turning out to be a better world citizen than his ragged, revolutionary predecessor and the evolution of Communist doctrine into a pragmatic quest for a steadily rising standard of living is now regarded by most experts as a stabilizing factor in world affairs.

18124

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 10, 1966

Certainly Red China's present adversities bring no assurances of peace. The desperate search for food, actually causing Chinese agents to compete with Russians in the Canadian and Australian markets, cannot render the government more stable. The decision to educate fewer students in Chinese universities, because the economy does not provide jobs for an expanding number of graduates, will delay the emergence of the professional class which now exerts a constructive authority in Moscow.

Experts of the Defense and State Departments have just sent to the White House an exhaustive study of the future that lies ahead for Red China. The short-term view is uncertain. No one can really predict how a government so beset by afflictions will react. But the long-term view follows the Soviet pattern—at some point the Chinese commissars will drop their visions of dominating the planet and turn to the real and pressing challenges of development at home.

The turn to maturity may come more swiftly in China than it did in the Soviet Union, where Joseph Stalin prolonged the revolutionary illusions. Containment, as in Russia's case, is apt to be a more maturing influence than the aggression envisioned by Ky or the deprivation sought by the Senate majority.

**ADDRESS OF SENATOR KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO THE
ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE
SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP
CONFERENCE, JACKSON,
MISS.**

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, to the annual convention of Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Jackson, Miss., August 8, 1966, be inserted at this point in the RECORD. It is a stirring and challenging message which merits widespread attention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY
TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE
SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE,
JACKSON, MISS., AUGUST 8, 1966**

I come here tonight as a young man, with the hope of the young that today's crisis can become tomorrow's opportunity. Much of your success is due to the young people who have worked in your movement.

I am proud to appear before this organization. For ten years, you have been in the forefront of the most important domestic issue of our time. You have been jailed and bombed, beaten and stoned. But you have persevered. Your work has given Negro men and women a new sense of dignity and self-respect. Your courage under fire has kindled the conscience of the white people of this country. Over the noise of battle, clearer than the cries of extremists on both sides, we have heard your simple message of non-violence, telling us that evil can be overcome with good; that hate can yield to love; and that it is better to suffer in dignity than to accept segregation in silence.

Your leader, Martin Luther King, has made his mark upon the world as a great spiritual leader who has also led the forces of social justice. His tradition is worthy of his teachers, Gandhi and Thoreau. I know the great respect that President Kennedy had for Dr. King. I am honored to share the platform with him today.

And I am proud to come to Mississippi, a state whose men have always answered bravely and patriotically the call to the

colors; a state with a past full of glory and tragedy; a present full of struggle and change; a future bright with hope and promise.

This is a state with unlimited potential. From the rockets and shipyards on the Gulf to new industries in the north, Mississippi is gathering force for an advance which could, using the full energies of all its citizens, bring a greater day than it has ever known.

I come from a state with a proud tradition of leadership in the field of human rights. It was a citizen of Massachusetts who was the first to urge the use of nonviolence in the cause of civil rights. His name was William Lloyd Garrison, and his statue stands in Boston today. In 1831, he wrote: "The history of mankind is crowded with evidence that physical coercion is not adapted to moral regeneration; that sin can be subdued only by love; and that the violent who resort to the sword are destined to perish with the sword."

My state, as the other states in the North, has very difficult problems in the field of civil rights. I cannot come here to Mississippi and say that our hands are clean. We have done too little. We started quite late. The Negro in Boston, to our shame, goes to a segregated school, holds an inferior job, and lives in one of the worst parts of the city. Progress has been made, some important programs just in recent days, but we have a long way to go. So I am delighted that this organization is extending its work to the cities of the North. We need your help up there too.

Twenty years ago, segregation was a fact of life in America, accepted by both races. The Capital city of our country was totally segregated, in law and in fact.

Twenty years ago, the U.S. Congress could not even outlaw lynching. A distinguished Senator, Frank Graham, was turned out of office because he signed a report saying that Negroes should have an equal chance in jobs.

But then came the Supreme Court decisions. And the sit-ins, and the freedom rides, and your own bus boycott in Montgomery, touching off a movement that has brought about, in my opinion, the most important change in America in the last 20 years.

Since 1959, Congress has passed three civil rights bills, and this year will pass a fourth. The walls of segregation have come down in many places, partly through government, but largely through the private efforts of groups like yours. Over two million Negroes have registered to vote throughout the South, one hundred twenty thousand in Mississippi in the last year alone. The caste system in politics is through. Next year, in this state, in every election, men and women, white and black, will have a chance to have a voice. I think this will make a difference.

But in a larger sense, how far have we come as a nation?

After all the decisions of all of the courts, how many Negro children really attend integrated schools? In the South, less than 3 per cent.

After all of the programs that Congress has passed, how much has the life of the average Negro really changed? Not very much.

What good is a desegregated motel if you can't afford to stay there?

What use is the right to vote if you risk your job and even your life in order to vote?

Can a Negro soldier, drafted to fight for the freedom of the people of Vietnam, come back to his own country and enjoy full freedom and opportunity as an American citizen? I don't think he can. And that is the shame and the challenge of American life in 1966.

The rate of Negro unemployment is more than twice that of white—and the gap has increased in the past year. Even when the Negro finds a job, it tends to be in menial

occupations with extremely limited opportunities for advancement.

The proportion of Negroes living in substandard housing is almost three times that of whites, and that proportion is growing. The Negro continues to be segregated in the great urban ghettos, and that segregation is increasing. Negroes today in the cities of the North live their daily lives farther separated from white America than the rural Southern Negro ever was.

I find this country dividing more and more into separate societies, of the rich and poor, the white and the black, the complacent and the despairing; where the whites have jobs and the blacks have unemployment; where the whites live in suburbs and the Negroes in ghettos. Where each looks at the other with growing mistrust as the vise of apartness tightens.

This situation is wrong—morally, socially, economically wrong. It saps our strength. It offends our deepest traditions. It sows the seed of insurrection and riot.

I cannot think of a more dangerous future for America than the future we face if we let this situation develop as it has.

This situation has been aggravated in recent months by the desire of some Negro leaders to pull apart from the white men who have been assisting them. Now I can fully understand the feelings behind this. For one hundred years since the end of slavery you have collaborated with white men and many Negroes have little to show for it. But the fact is that the greatest gains in civil rights have come when black and white have worked together. The very basis of integration is working together with white people. If you cast them off—if you isolate yourselves—you will be strengthening the bonds of the whole system of segregation. You will be crippling your own effectiveness in what is basically not a white or a Negro cause, but an American cause. Dr. King put it well when he said: "The Negro's destiny is tied to the white man's destiny. The Negro's freedom is bound to the white man's freedom. We cannot walk alone."

I would add that just as the path of separatism is a self-defeating path, the path of violence is a dangerous path. You can reason with the white man, and pressure him and even shame him—but you cannot scare him. Dr. King once said that the civil rights movement owes as much to Bull Connor as it does to Abraham Lincoln. And I say to you that your cause is immeasurably hurt every time a young Negro throws a Molotov cocktail or a sniper fires on police from the roof of a ghetto.

I would be less than frank with you if I did not admit a growing feeling of concern about the "white backlash" in our country. A Negro leader in New York last week said he had never been so fearful about the future of race relations in our country as he is now, because a terrifying white backlash has set in and the Negro still has gained so little.

Let those who preach violence or the dishonoring of our individual obligations to our country or the destruction of Western civilization realize what ammunition they are giving the enemies of reason and justice.

But I would say just as strongly to the white man that you can no longer expect to keep the Negro "in his place." The only place for him is a position of full equality as an American citizen. If you think the Negro is pushing too fast, you are wrong. You cannot expect a man to go slow in obtaining what should have been a part of his birthright.

Seventy years ago a man named William Jennings Bryan spoke for the impoverished white man of the South and Midwest. What he said in his "Cross of Gold" speech expresses what many Negroes understandably feel today: "We have petitioned and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated and our entreaties have been disregarded.

Wick left for home late last February. He took with him two vivid pictures:

One, the picture of young Marines at war, with verve and with valor charging smack into the enemy, mixing with the enemy, defeating the enemy. (Wick talked so much about the Marines on his return that his son up and joined the Marine Corps!)

Two, the picture of these same young Americans, in the wake of battle, pouring their hearts and their energies and their resources into helping the Vietnamese people.

Wick vowed he wouldn't forget these two pictures. On his return to Texas, he launched himself on the lecture circuit, rallying support for America's fighting men and their efforts to assist the Vietnamese.

But he went further than that. He called on Governor John Connally of Texas, explaining to him about the Marine Corps' civic action program. Wick also spoke to officers of the Texas Air National Guard.

And a new drive was under way, a drive to raise friendship kits to send to the Marines in Viet Nam to assist in their pacification efforts.

Just recently an Air Guard plane touched down at the Da Nang Air Base. It was laden with friendship kits.

The kits, made of plastic mesh, contained items such as pencil sharpeners, rulers, needles, thread, soap, chewing gum, candy and cigarettes.

Each kit bore a message—in English and Vietnamese—which read:

"This friendship kit has been assembled by Texans, under sponsorship of the Texas Guard, as a message of our support of the cause of freedom for the people of South Vietnam. John Connally, governor of Texas."

And that's how the spirit of Wick Fowler returned to aid the Marines in Viet Nam—in the form of little friendship kits which will help a bit to brighten the lives of people in this long-suffering land.

It was a nice gesture, a typically big Texas gesture.

But then, Texas is a big state. And Wick Fowler is a big man.

KITS HELP SOOTHE FEELINGS—DURING SEARCH FOR CONG

DA NANG, VIET NAM.—"Friendship kits" from Texas were used to soothe hurt feelings today when a South Vietnamese hamlet was searched for evidence of Viet Cong sympathizers.

The treats were handed out to Vietnamese children and adults at a "county fair" operation in a tiny village about 10 miles north-east of Da Nang.

Such operations are routinely carried out in hamlets of South Viet Nam where the loyalty of residents to the government is questionable. Local militiamen, backed by U.S. marines, moved the villagers out of their homes for interrogation and a methodical search of the houses.

While the village men were being questioned to determine if any residents were Communist sympathizers and to learn if there had been any Communist troops in the area recently, the women were given canned fish, rice, cooking pots and stoves to prepare a community lunch. The activity is designed to make the search for Communists more like a picnic or county fair than a military operation.

Lt. Glenn Wapp of Riverside, Calif., who was running the show, said "the Leather-necks tried to cook the rice but the villagers didn't like that."

"They wanted to do it themselves," he said.

After lunch, the "friendship kits" were passed out causing a mad scramble among the village youngsters. The kits included candy, toothpaste, tooth brushes, pencils and balloons. Imitation Indian headbands—complete with feathers—were slipped into some kits.

Most bags contained packets of cigarettes, but some youngsters didn't resist the temptation to light up. The villagers were also shown movies and given medical treatment.

The "Friendship Kits" were the innovation of the Denton Record-Chronicler's Viet Nam war correspondent, Wick Fowler.

When he returned to Texas after three months of war reporting, he designed the kits and enlisted the aid of Gov. John Connally. Meantime, the Marines in Viet Nam agreed to distribute the kits as a test of their value in the Marines' civil action operations.

Two thousand kits, each containing a greeting from the governor, were sent to Viet Nam by the Texas Guard, a civilian group, in cooperation with the Texas National Guard. From California, the kits were flown across the Pacific by the California National Guard.

The kits included 1,000 drawings by school children of Denton.

Wapp, a marine platoon leader who had been wounded three times in eight months, was assigned to the civil affairs program five days ago.

"I've got six kids at home and I like being with kids," Wapp said. "This gives me a great opportunity to do that."

A TOURIST'S VIEW OF VIETNAM "WAR"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the greatest problems we have when we come to consider great foreign policy questions such as foreign aid or Vietnam is our inability to recognize the extent to which the objectivity of our judgment is impaired by our own image of ourselves. From time to time I have tried, not with any great success I fear, to call attention to this failing of ours.

Some of the clearest pictures which have been drawn of the American people and character have been those of foreign observers. In this connection one thinks immediately of distinguished names such as those of Alexis de Tocqueville or Bryce. A friend of mine in Arkansas, however, recently sent me an article of this nature written by a rather obscure—at least to me—observer appearing in a Philippine newspaper which could not have been expected to attract notice in this country. With due apology to the author, its style may appear not altogether that to which we are accustomed, but I suggest, Mr. President, that its content is well worth considering. While I would not entirely go along with everything in the article—for example the inference that the President has a low regard for human life—the author presents an interesting view of ourselves as others see us.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "A Tourist's View of the Vietnam 'War,'" written by Cecile Afable in the Baguio, Philippines, Midland Courier be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TOURIST'S VIEW OF VIETNAM WAR (By Cecile Afable)

Advisers—a new breed of Americans, product of 20th century colonialism. Installed in air-conditioned sanctuaries, they are paid to think and hence to give "advice". This is taken very seriously by the American officials especially the civilians. The Americans in Vietnam are supposed to be only just "adviser", an excuse to make the American presence palatable to the world and to the

American people. It is also a concession to their feeling and the Americans have a complementary need to believe and practice it. It provides the only excuse for their presence in Vietnam. At the same time it is the only way by which they can deny themselves the responsibility of what is happening around them, a way of shielding themselves from the ugliness of what is going on. In simple terms, it is a moral anesthetic.

These advisers say: "We are here to help the Vietnamese help themselves". That is exactly what they are doing—helping themselves. This advisory capacity is a gimmick invented by America to find a reason to intervene in developing countries. They come in all guises; "experts" under certain foundations or missions.

Why America will not withdraw. The Americans are committed to protect the South Vietnamese, it is a moral commitment. And if they should withdraw now a blood bath will ensue once the National Liberation Front gains control. Yet what is happening now is a thorough blood bath without end. Maybe if the Americans will leave there will be a bloodbath with an end, but right now there is no end to it. It is better to have an end with misery than to have misery without end.

Why are the refugees crowding Government centers? I visited Mai Tam in one of the centers and she said: "Bombings, it is the bombings and fighting on both sides, that drive them to our centers." The refugees are told to say that they were fleeing from VC terrorism and that they want a happy life under the Government in Saigon.

The new type of American soldiers in Vietnam. The majority of them are new types of dissenters, whose life has been disturbed when there is no immediate danger to it—has been ordered to go and fight in a distant war where the people are not even interested to fight for themselves. He thinks the war is "not worth a single American life, even a Vietnamese life." He has a high regard for human life and he hates to needlessly kill for the view of a few people like President Johnson and his advisers. He wants his country to pull out because, "I do not think communist control of South Vietnam will concern me in my life time."

Another type of soldier is the angry one. He wants to "bomb the —" out of the villages and hamlets and let them get it. These are the most dangerous ones for they do it once in a while for fun and they might really do it more and more.

Another group are the professional army men who must have wars to direct and fight for they are useless in a peaceful country. To them must be victory at any cost.

Then there are the bitter draftees who are drafted because "they cannot afford to go to college". If they were in college they will not be there since they would have been exempted. One of them said, "I do not believe that communist control of Vietnam is a threat to ourselves. The commitment to Vietnam is all out of proportion to the importance of Vietnam." Another who was sounding like Lippmann said, "If we start here we will be doing the same thing all over the world."

The bitterest, anti-ideologists said, "The people here have been fighting a guerilla war for 20 years, I don't know anything about that kind of warfare. Must I die in it?"

An Igorot, (not Lamen) looks at the war. The Americans express the belief that their fighting in Vietnam is to oppose communists China because this is the "expert" opinion of American experts. Yet they cannot prove that the North Liberation Front in Chinese beyond Hanoi. And to fight the Chinese through Vietnam gives it a stint of insanity. For here the death of the Vietnamese is unrelated to their lives. Do the Americans have to kill all the Vietnamese to stop the Chinese from threatening them? Then the

We have begged and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer. We entreat no more. We petition no more. We defy them."

So I say to the white man: You are not going to solve this problem with riot guns and billy clubs. The police and public officials cannot do the job alone. You cannot protect your communities against violence if you are unwilling to act against the conditions that breed violence. And you can no more justify violence and lawlessness in Cleveland and Chicago with the slogan of "White Power" than the Negro can with "Black Power."

My own Irish forebears were discriminated against just as fiercely in the last century as the Negroes are today. As an American proud of my country, I know that much of its strength is drawn from the contributions minorities have made as they have been given opportunities. I know that America will prosper best if we white men open wide the doors of opportunity to you.

If we can prosecute the War on Poverty, it will help white people as well as black.

If we can train more men for jobs, and end discrimination in jobs, it will increase the wealth of all.

If we can eliminate the slums and improve the schools of Chicago and Cleveland and Boston, it will make them better cities for everyone who lives there.

We need a program of action which can help bridge the gap in opportunity—and we need it now. Of course, we should continue to press for full legal rights for all citizens—the right to vote unintimidated; the right to be effectively protected from violence; the right to equal justice, free from jury discrimination; the right to go to school and live in a home free from arbitrary segregation. But in addition we need a massive commitment of national resources to the up-grading of Negro life in America.

We need community projects that can be done this summer and this fall: Construction of swimming pools and recreational parks in the ghettos; installation of sprinklers for children in hot weather; better garbage collections and block clean-up campaigns; typing classes, and athletic instruction. Through these projects we can show young people that their communities do care about them—that there is hope for improvement, and that there are more creative outlets for their young energies than violence and disorder.

But we need more than these stop gap measures. There must be no less than a major up-grading of our schools and our cities, and of the housing and job opportunities for Negro Americans. Many of the programs to accomplish these objectives already exist.

What we must do now is determine to spend the money necessary to make these programs work. We must expand, not cut back, on our commitment to the War on Poverty. We must expand not cut back on our programs to equalize and upgrade education and, most important of all, we must expand not cut back on our programs to revitalize the ghetto and provide decent housing for all Americans.

I consider the segregation of our urban ghettos the basic cause of the racial crisis that will continue to plague us. For as long as the Negro is isolated from white Americans and denied mobility and access to decent housing, his children will go to segregated schools of inferior quality, he will pay more for the inferior housing to which he does have access and he will be cut off from the power structures of government—unable to communicate or participate in the white society that surrounds him.

The expansion of these programs will cost a great deal of money; but we can afford it. We have the resources many times over. The only thing we may lack is the will. We are

spending two billion dollars a month to defend the freedom of 14 million people in South Vietnam. Why shouldn't we make the same kind of effort for the 20 million people of the Negro race right here in America, whose freedom and future is also at stake?

The time has come to stop the talk and begin the action.

Let us stop talking about the need for young educated Negro leaders and make sure that every American who has the will and intellectual capacity has a chance to go to college.

Let us stop counting the slums and start tearing them down—followed by the greatest construction program in our history.

Let us stop deploring unemployment and create the jobs that will beautify our country and make our cities better places to live.

Let us desegregate our schools, but let us spare no effort to be sure that our children in school today have the educational opportunity to give their lives meaning and hope.

All these things should be done not just because they will stop the riots—although they will; not just because they will strengthen our economy—although they will. These things should be done because they are right and decent and the moral things to do.

So let men of both colors complete the agenda of freedom—together.

Let us together work so that a James Meredith can walk down the highway here in Mississippi free from the threat of violence.

Let us together wipe out the immoral system of jury discrimination so that the men who kill for hate will pay the price of their crime. So the men who killed those four little girls in the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham will be brought to justice.

Let us together work for the day when children of both races, in whose young hearts prejudice does not exist, can go to school together.

Let us together create open cities, free of slums, in every part of America—cities where men can reach new heights of civilization and people can live where they wish.

And let us keep working together until the last remnant of poverty, the last barrier to prosperity, the last obstacle to equal opportunity is gone from American life.

President Kennedy was the first President of the United States to state publicly that segregation was morally wrong. If his life and death had a meaning, if the life and death of Reverend Reeb and Medgar Evers and Jimmy Lee Jackson had a meaning, it was that we should not hate but love one another; we should use what power we have not to create conditions of oppression that lead to violence, but conditions of freedom and opportunity that lead to peace.

No one denies the difficulties of your tasks. No one can forget your courage and determination.

No one can blur your vision and your dream.

It is the vision of Americans and the dream of justice and opportunity for all of us.

Let us work together to make that dream reality, realizing that the greatness of our country depends on our success.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY TEXANS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Texans have many things to be proud of. But the folks around Denton have the added privilege of being proud—and fond—of Wick Fowler.

Wick is a retired Dallas newspaperman who has been covering the Vietnam war recently for the Denton Record-Chronicle. While there, he hit upon the idea of friendship kits to be sent from the United States to the marines in Vietnam to assist them in their civic action

programs and efforts. The kits contain items such as pencil sharpeners, rulers, chewing gum, candy, and so forth.

The Denton Record-Chronicle recently carried several articles describing Wick's idea and how it was received by the Vietnamese.

Mr. President, I ask that these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point so that other Senators may read for themselves of the people-to-people actions being undertaken by Texans who are concerned about international goodwill.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO VIETNAM: FOWLER RETURNS—IN SPIRIT

DA NANG, VIET NAM.—Wick Fowler—one of the biggest Texans of all—has returned to Viet Nam. In spirit, that is.

But Fowler in spirit is bigger than many men in their entirety.

Fowler, in person (who is huge enough without even considering the spirit!), came to Viet Nam last December as a special combat correspondent for the Denton Record-Chronicle.

A retired Dallas newspaperman, he was a combat correspondent in World War II in Europe and the Pacific.

Upon his arrival in Da Nang, headquarters of the III Marine Amphibious Force, Fowler immediately endeared himself to the Marines as well as to members of the civilian press corps.

He reported the war, as combat correspondents are supposed to do. But more than that, he was an entertainer.

There grew a saying that the only thing wider than Wick's ample girth was his even wider repertoire of homespun tales and jokes.

And Wick fired them at the Marines just as they fired their rifles and machineguns at the enemy—rapidly, effectively, and on the target.

There was a rumor that a Marine troop-carrying helicopter, which usually carries seven gear-laden Leathernecks into battle, couldn't get off the ground once Wick entered it—alone!

The rumor was never verified. But there is proof that a C130 cargo plane, with Wick aboard, did manage to stay airborne all the way on a flight from Da Nang to Saigon.

His fellow passengers testified to that—with great sighs of relief.

On another occasion, Wick boarded a Navy troop-carrying ship prior to Operation Double Eagle, which was to be the largest Marine amphibious assault on enemy territory since the historic landing at Inchon, Korea, in 1951.

The morning of the landing loomed dark, dismal and rainy. The sea buffeted the huge Navy vessel as sailors began lowering landing craft over the side.

Then the netting was tossed over the rails on either side of the ship, and Marines began scrambling down the nets toward the landing craft, bobbing and plummeting in the wild sea.

Wick had every intention of following the Marines. He was prepared to go over. But a cautious Marine company commander prohibited him from doing so.

Some onlookers thought it was because, well, because the Marine officer was concerned about Wick's safety (much to the rotund writer's chagrin.) Such a large man, and certainly not nearly as young and agile as the Marines.

But others wondered if it wasn't because the Marine officer was worried that Wick would take up more space in a landing craft than a squad of Marines!

Anyway, that was Wick Fowler and he did eventually get ashore on the operation.

Americans are involve in killing people to show other people to stop threatening them. Or do the Americans want to show the Chinese to stop threatening the Vietnamese, whom they are killing anyway? Then the Chinese threat obscures in advance the nature of the enemy. Shucks.

Who really is the enemy of the Americans in Vietnam? What does this enemy want? Why do the Americans always fail to recognize nationalism and its human aspirations? Not recognizing it they destroy it. By opposing it as is happening in this country, they drive it to self-defeating dependence upon major communists powers. Nationalism is a taboo subject in Vietnam.

The Vietnam soldier's part in this war. They are undisciplined, they are lazy and they smoke and chat too much while on patrol duty according to their American counterparts. Their disinterestedness is shocking and they are consistent deserters. Then they are said to create situations in order to increase American involvement in the war. "They would rather join bicycle races than help us fight their war," said one soldier, who also suspected that the Vietnamese is more interested in making a "fast buck than anything else."

Medicine man America. To an Igorot like me, America is a medicine man who is out to exercise the "forces of evil" from a people who refuse to give it up. That their processes of divination is cruder than that of my Igorot "Mumbonong" (priestess). Take their "domino theory" as an example, a clear thinking American cannot believe this and there are many more of them than their opposites. Where did the American policy makers get the idea that if Vietnam falls to Communist control, the whole of Southeast Asia will be swallowed?

If America wants to play medicine man to the entire world they should start learning more subtle techniques in divination and more gentler methods of exercising "forces of evils." This is only proper for their present role as the greatest, richest and most advanced nation in the world.

A MASSIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on Monday I delivered a speech in Jackson, Miss., in which I called for a much greater commitment to the upgrading of the life of the Negro in this country than we are making now.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to enter into the Record an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of August 9, which shows quite forcefully the steps we must take in this direction and the reasons we must take them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 9, 1966]

A MASSIVE PROGRAM

It seems likely that the American people will soon be asked if they are prepared to spend large sums of money (and how much) for an all-out attack on those conditions producing today's racial unrest. When two such national figures as McGeorge Bundy, former White House special assistant and now head of the Ford Foundation, and America's foremost Negro public figure, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., raise the same question at almost the same moment, we can be fairly sure that here is an issue about which we shall all hear much in the near future.

Dr. King has proposed that during the next 10 years the United States spend \$10 billion yearly for a kind of homefront Marshall

Plan to attack the educational and living conditions which breed Negro discontent. Although Mr. Bundy named no figure, it would appear that he had roughly the same figure in mind in his suggestion of a nationwide effort to help the Negro.

Even if several billions of dollars are subtracted yearly for programs already under way, it is clear that both of these men envisage massive expenditures.

Three questions present themselves at once: (a) is such a program needed, (b) can the country afford it, and (c) will it do the trick?

It does not seem to us that there can be any doubt but that something of a massive and deep-going nature is needed. Efforts so far have clearly not succeeded in outrooting the cause of racial unrest. Indeed, such unrest appears to be spreading. It is by now a truism that the racial situation cannot be permitted to drag along, gradually worsening, without some new, inspired and workable effort to correct it.

Although we assume that Dr. King's figure was merely a general one, it would seem that the American economy (estimated to be presently growing at the rate of between \$40 and \$50 billion a year) could absorb without too great sacrifice such an effort. Indeed, the question might arise: Can America afford not to make such an effort? Furthermore, if such a program is reasonably successful, it could be expected to accelerate the nation's economic growth, becoming thereby in whole or in part self-liquidating.

It is, of course, utterly impossible to say whether even an effort of this size will, in fact, "do the trick."

It depends upon the extent to which these programs are oriented both toward providing greater opportunities and toward encouraging those improvements in mental, moral, and social conditions which will enable slum-dwellers to make adequate use of improved conditions. Spending large sums of money will not solve the problem unless it stimulates the deep-seated changes in attitudes, education, standards of conduct, and employability which are at the heart of the problem.

A year ago, following the Watts rioting, these columns called for massive, nationwide effort on behalf of the Negro. We believe that such a need is even more apparent today. But such an effort will be fruitless unless it simultaneously accomplishes three things. The first is the elimination of the physical conditions of slum living. The second is the elimination of those barriers of prejudice and discrimination which have helped force the Negro into the slums. The third is the elimination of those mental, social, and moral legacies of the past which help perpetuate the problem.

STIMULATION OF THE FLOW OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FHA- AND VA-ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1393, S. 3688.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will have some remarks to make on this bill but that it will not be concluded this evening.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the committee bill, S. 3688, has as its purpose to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for FHA- and VA-assisted residential construction.

This would be done in two ways: First, it would provide new borrowing authority to the secondary mortgage facility of the Federal National Mortgage Association by authorizing FNMA to issue debentures up to 15 times its capital instead of the current authority of 10 times. The effect of this is to add about \$2 billion new purchasing authority under this facility. Second, the bill would further increase FNMA's purchasing authority by authorizing an additional \$1 billion in its special assistance function to purchase FHA and VA mortgages which do not exceed \$15,000.

One of the most critical problems facing our economy today is the shortage of mortgage capital for home financing. The homebuilding industry is suffering one of its worst setbacks, from which it may not recover for many years to come. Building materials producers, real estate brokers, furnituremakers, and many other related activities are feeling the pinch of the mortgage credit shortage. More important, families seeking homes cannot buy even those houses already built because of the shortage of mortgage credit.

Mr. President, a recent survey of the impact of the credit shortage on future plans of the Nation's homebuilders revealed that residential construction starts will be down by about one-third for the remainder of this year. The latest monthly starts figures from the Department of Commerce show residential construction proceeding in June at an average annual rate of 1,264,000—down 18 percent from June of 1965. There are predictions that this rate will drop substantially below this in the coming months.

Mr. President, this situation is very disturbing to me, as I am sure it is to others who are concerned not only about homebuilding, but also about providing decent housing for our people. We realize that the basic cause of the mortgage credit shortage is the overall shortage of capital needed to finance an economy operating at full capacity levels. I understand this, but I do not believe that it is fair for homebuilders and home buyers to have to carry such a heavy share of this burden.

There are a number of remedies proposed to ease the shortage of capital on our economy and to create a better climate for mortgage lending. The Committee on Banking and Currency is considering these proposals and may make some recommendations in the future. Unfortunately, there are many problems

in developing a consensus on the steps to take for a long-range remedy because of the involvement of so many groups whose interests may be seriously affected by the pending proposals.

Fortunately, however, the committee knew of no serious disagreement about the FNMA proposal now before us and gave strong bipartisan support for its quick passage by the Senate. Senator JOHN TOWER, ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, had introduced in the Senate S. 3482 which contained a FNMA provision similar in part to those in my bill S. 3529 which I had introduced on June 21. Senator TOWER can speak for himself, but I believe he strongly supports the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate has two sections. Section 1 would provide new borrowing authority to the secondary mortgage facility by authorizing FNMA to issue debentures up to 15 times its capital instead of the current authority of 10 times. The effect of this is to add about \$2 billion new purchasing authority under this facility.

Mr. President, I have a table which shows the status of the secondary market operation under FNMA. Under existing law, FNMA's borrowing authority is \$4,016,256,930, whereas, under the proposed amendment, its borrowing authority would amount to \$6,024,385,395, which amounts to an increase of about \$2 billion. The existing unused borrowing authority is now \$746,926,930; so that once this bill becomes law, the association would have a total unused borrowing authority of about \$2.7 billion. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the FNMA table.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal National Mortgage Association, secondary market operations, private borrowing authority

Capital and surplus (authorized at June 30, 1966)-----	\$401,615,693
10-fold borrowing leverage (authorized)-----	4,016,256,930
15-fold borrowing leverage (authorized plus 50 percent) S. 3688-----	6,024,385,395
CAPITAL AND SURPLUS AT JUNE 30, 1966	
Preferred stock authorized--	207,820,305
Common stock subscription and paid-in capital surplus-----	111,581,747
Preferred and Common equity-----	82,223,641
Total-----	401,625,693

BORROWINGS AT JUNE 30, 1966

Debentures-----	2,180,050,000
Short-term discount notes--	1,089,280,000
U.S. Treasury, interim-----	0
Total-----	3,269,330,000

Borrowing authority June 30--	4,016,256,930
Approximate unused borrowing authority-----	746,926,930

At June 30, 1966, \$141,820,305 preferred stock was being utilized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, FNMA has placed restrictions on the purchasing of mortgages under its secondary market operations because of the

concern that its funds would be quickly dissipated under current conditions. It has placed a ceiling of \$15,000 on the amount of the mortgage it will buy. It has reduced the price to as low as 95 for 5 1/4 percent mortgages and it has limited its purchases to highly selective and good quality mortgage loans. Despite these limitations, the offerings have been so great that FNMA has purchased in the last month at an average weekly rate of about \$43 million.

The pending bill would alleviate FNMA's problem and permit it to revise upward its ceiling of \$15,000 and remove much of its present restrictions.

Section 2 of the bill would also increase FNMA's purchasing authority under its special assistance function with a \$1 billion new authority in order to provide funds for financing low-cost housing which is not available under existing market conditions. This provision would limit the mortgage amount to \$15,000 on FHA- and VA-assisted mortgages. The funding would come from two sources--\$500 million from the Presidential authority, which now has an uncommitted balance of about \$1.8 billion, and \$500 million new Treasury borrowing. In view of FNMA's new authority to sell participations, the impact on the budget of such borrowing should be minor.

There has been some concern that the \$500 million to be taken from the Presidential fund will deny some funds to the FHA section 221(d) (3) program. This concern is without foundation because \$950 million of that fund is now scheduled for use in 1968 and 1969. All the amendment would do is to borrow from that part of the Presidential fund which the President has reserved for fiscal year 1969. Our problems today surely ought to be taken care of first before we worry about 1969. Those who express concern about this should be assured that adequate funds will be available to take care of section 221(d) (3) when the need is truly demonstrated.

The purpose of the new purchasing authority is to provide adequate funds for FNMA operations so that it can buy higher priced mortgages in its secondary market function and at the same time provide a market for lower priced mortgages in its special assistance function. These two operations, acting in conjunction with each other, I believe, will be a helpful support to the mortgage money market at this particular period.

I understand there has been some concern expressed about the \$15,000 ceiling in the bill for the special assistance mortgages. Some homebuilders claim they cannot build homes today within this ceiling and therefore it should be raised or removed. I cannot understand this because I have figures to show that FHA is insuring at prices well within this ceiling.

According to figures given to me by the Federal Housing Administration, the range of averages for mortgages insured under section 203(b) during the last quarter of 1965 indicates that FHA has been insuring at levels well within the proposed \$15,000 ceiling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table showing

the FHA average mortgage amounts by State and by region for section 203(b) mortgages during the last quarter of 1965.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average mortgage amount for proposed new homes with FHA-insured mortgages under sec. 203(b), 4th quarter 1965--Range of averages within region

	Range	Low	High
New England		\$15,051	\$15,051
Connecticut-----	(1)		
Maine-----	(1)		
Massachusetts-----	\$15,051		
New Hampshire-----	(1)		
Rhode Island-----	(1)		
Vermont-----	(1)		
Middle Atlantic		14,692	16,160
New Jersey-----	16,160		
New York-----	15,065		
Pennsylvania-----	14,692		
East North Central		14,725	16,255
Illinois-----	16,255		
Indiana-----	14,961		
Michigan-----	14,725		
Ohio-----	15,628		
Wisconsin-----	15,995		
West North Central		15,519	17,388
Iowa-----	15,981		
Kansas-----	(1)		
Minnesota-----	17,388		
Missouri-----	15,519		
Nebraska-----	16,234		
North Dakota-----	(1)		
South Dakota-----	(1)		
South Atlantic		14,167	16,462
Delaware-----	16,462		
District of Columbia-----	(1)		
Florida-----	15,604		
Georgia-----	15,568		
Maryland-----	14,167		
North Carolina-----	15,327		
South Carolina-----	14,917		
Virginia-----	16,012		
West Virginia-----	(1)		
East South Central		14,270	16,008
Alabama-----	16,008		
Kentucky-----	14,270		
Mississippi-----	14,560		
Tennessee-----	15,124		
West South Central		14,410	17,072
Arkansas-----	14,773		
Louisiana-----	17,072		
Oklahoma-----	14,410		
Texas-----	14,965		
Mountain		15,236	17,306
Arizona-----	15,236		
Colorado-----	16,409		
Idaho-----	16,938		
Montana-----	16,569		
Nevada-----	17,306		
New Mexico-----	16,943		
Wyoming-----	(1)		
Utah-----	16,114		
Pacific Coast States		14,586	19,493
California-----	19,493		
Oregon-----	14,586		
Washington-----	17,125		
Alaska-----	29,298		
Hawaii-----	21,970		
Puerto Rico-----	15,598		

¹ Not available.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, these figures clearly show that homebuilders have, in fact, been building at levels averaging around \$15,000 in almost all regions of the United States. It seems to me that when the Federal Government uses special assistance funds, they should be only for homes priced at a level that families of low and moderate income can buy. The need is obviously greatest at this level and I believe that the Federal Government should direct its greatest effort to the greatest need.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of the FNMA bill, the housing bill, the urban mass transportation bill, and the comprehensive city demonstration bill, that necessary and appropriate staff members be given the privilege of the floor and admitted to the Chamber.

well with strained meat blended with the old standby.

The University of Hawaii has become extremely interested in the case. Nutrition experts there have been corresponding with the Morrisons and ask to be kept informed of the infant's progress.

And the parents, needless to say, are relieved—and thankful.

"We aren't calling Teresa Wyatt Urp anymore," Morrison said with a grin. "Now I suppose we'll have to come up with some sort of a Hawaiian nickname for her..."

French Guiana: A New "In" Place for Russian Missile Launchers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a report of particular importance to the United States, by Richard Lewis in the Chicago Sun-Times of August 7, 1966, discusses the possibilities of the establishment by the Russians of rocket-launching facilities in the Western Hemisphere, as a result of the French-Soviet agreement on space exploration. Mr. Lewis speculates on the implications that the French launching site may have for the security of the hemisphere as a whole and of the United States in particular. Considering the acute problems that have developed between France and the United States—with which President Johnson has not yet come to grips—the question is obviously an important one.

This report is timely and merits serious attention and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

FRENCH GUIANA: A NEW "IN" PLACE FOR RUSSIAN MISSILE LAUNCHERS?

(By Richard Lewis)

While details of the Franco-Soviet deal on space co-operation have not been made public, American space experts concede it has opened the door for Russian missilemen to reestablish rocket launching facilities in the Western Hemisphere.

This time, the scene would be French Guiana on the northeast coast of South America, about 2,000 miles south of Cuba from which Russian rocketeers were evicted in 1963.

France is completing a rocket range there in the northern part of the territory, on a strip of land 180 miles wide overlooking the Atlantic Ocean.

The launch site is 5 degrees north of the equator, making it ideal for launching satellites and probes into equatorial orbit, and about 30 miles from the city of Cayenne. Not far away is France's old, infamous penal colony of Devil's Island.

The French have invited the United States, the European Space Research Organization and the European Launcher Development Organization to use the Guiana range. In the case of the United States, the invitation was accompanied by a suggestion that some financing would be helpful.

The first section of the range, which is 12 miles wide and about 90 miles long, is to be opened in 1968, when the French expect to begin using it to test upper stages of their Diamant rocket.

Space officials assume that the space agreement signed by French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville and Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet minister of foreign affairs, contemplates Russian use of the facility. However, spokesmen for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the State Department's space "desk" say they have not seen any details of this agreement.

Dr. Daniel Frerejacques, French scientific attache in Washington, said that both ELDO and NASA had been invited to launch their own rockets from Guiana. The French expected that NASA would pay the cost of its own service towers and launch control facilities if France provided the pads, he said.

Asked if a similar invitation had been extended to Russia, Frerejacques said it had not. The Russians have not requested launch facilities, he said, and further, he doubted that they would.

Asked what his government's policy would be if the Soviets should request the same rocket launch privileges as NASA and ELDO, Frerejacques said this would require a decision at the highest government level.

From a military point of view, the Guiana range would open a missile corridor to the soft underbelly of the United States early warning systems. Except for surveillance apparatus by the U.S. Southern Command in the Panama Canal Zone, the main electronic pickets of the North American Air Defense Command look north, to the Arctic.

So far, there is no official concern in this country that France would allow Russia to use the Guiana launch pads to threaten the United States.

The French have described the Guiana range specifically as a space research launch facility only, built and operated by France's Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales, or space study center. It will replace the Hammaguir proving grounds in the Sahara, which France must evacuate by mid-1967 under an agreement with Algeria.

Consequently, it is assumed in NASA that any rockets the Russians take to Guiana would be designed for peaceful space projects.

Speculatively, however, it has been pointed out that Soviet satellite launch vehicles are missiles, just as are U.S. Thor, Atlas, and Titan rockets. Further, it is unlikely that the Russians would allow their larger space carriers, which are secret, to be launched by French crews.

Since France has invited the United States to use Guiana, it could scarcely keep Russian missiles out.

The only means of doing so would be to bar all foreign missiles from Guiana pads, allowing other nations to use only French space carriers launched by French crews to put their satellites in orbit. No such restriction was spelled out in the invitation to the United States, and no one who has studied the matter seriously believes there is any in the Franco-Russian space agreement.

In fact, such a restriction would make the Guiana port useless to the Russians for space research, since the only space launcher the French have developed is the Diamant.

This three-stage rocket standing 62 feet high is capable only of lofting a 175-pound payload into low Earth orbit. Its payload capability is equivalent to that of the U.S. Scout rocket, smallest space launcher in the American inventory.

Russian satellites have been heavy since the beginning of the space age. Sputnik I, launched nearly nine years ago, weighed 185 pounds—nine pounds more than Diamant's present payload. On the other hand, if the French allowed the Russians to haul big rockets to Guinea, it would undoubtedly generate serious tension in the Western world and in Europe.

Speculation about the Franco-Soviet agreement in South American journals has touched on this problem. So far, French

space experts have been able to say only that the conditions of sharing Guiana space facilities with any nation would be the subject of a special agreement with each one.

The official French-Soviet declaration on the matter issued June 30 states only that "the ministers of foreign affairs signed a co-operation agreement for the study and exploitation for space for peaceful ends, as well as an agreement on scientific, technical and economic co-operation."

Under such an agreement, the Russians could launch French satellites from spaceports in Central Asia or use launch facilities on French soil.

So far, American space experts have been content to wait and see what happens.

Scientifically, the Guiana facility offers several advantages as a launch site. One is that the Earth's rotation provides additional boost to a satellite on an easterly launch, as at Cape Kennedy.

So far, the possibility that the Russians might sneak missiles back across the Atlantic under their space agreement with France has not raised visible concern in NASA.

No one in the agency is anxious to speculate about it "at this point in time," as NASA people are fond of saying.

It may be that American space officials are hesitant to raise questions publicly that might irritate the sensitivities of the French government and abrade already taut relations.

But these questions are being raised privately. So far, no answers have been made public.

Nixon's Candid Appraisal of the Vietnam Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star in their editorial of August 9, comments very favorably upon Dick Nixon's latest assessment of the situation in Vietnam. The President continues to disavow the reports that his military advisers are asking for a bigger commitment of troops and materiel for the Vietnam conflict as a condition precedent to any foreseeable end to the hostilities there.

True, Dick Nixon can be an artful political partisan, but he has always been responsible in his criticism and in his assessment of our situation abroad. He has just as good a grasp of the world situation today, with all his traveling and contacts, as he did when he served with such distinction as our Vice President. As a matter of fact, his candid appraisals and forthright statements are in marked contrast to what little we can glean from our President's lugubrious foreign policy statements.

Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent that the aforementioned editorial be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

VIETNAM BUILDUP

Richard M. Nixon has been accused of playing some kind of political game in advocating the commitment of more troops and more airpower to the war in Viet Nam. But the fact seems to be quite to the contrary.

August 10, 1966

Nixon made his statements as he was leaving Saigon after meetings there with our high echelon military and diplomatic leaders. Undoubtedly his comments were a reflection of their views.

The former vice president called for a "substantial" increase in American ground forces and intensified bombing in the North. He apparently had in mind an increase in American forces to around 500,000 men. He thought that this, with heavier bombing, could bring a military conclusion within two or perhaps three years. Without this greater effort, he seemed to think the war might drag on for 10 to 20 years, as has been suggested by some American military commanders, by Marshal Ky and even by Ho Chi Minh.

Nixon said he understood the difficulties confronting the President in such a call-up, and added that no President could make this decision "in a political vacuum. Unless the American people support such a decision it would be self-defeating. It is time for the United States to be united in this struggle. Further debate as to our goal and objective in Viet Nam can only delay the end of the war, can only encourage the enemy."

As far as we can see, there is no partisan political gimmick in any of this. On the contrary, coming from one of the two front-running Republican presidential aspirants, it could be helpful to the Democratic administration.

The President, for understandable reasons, has not publicly mentioned any figure for the eventual size of the American commitment in Viet Nam, and there has been considerable equivocating in the Pentagon as to the probable duration of the war. One reason for this probably is that no one knows the precise answers.

It seems perfectly evident, however, that the American buildup will continue, and may very well reach 500,000. Nor does an early end to the war appear likely. In these circumstances, it seems to us that the Nixon statements were those of a responsible American, not the comments of a partisan nitpicker.

Great Society Fiscal Policies Trigger Current Labor-Management Difficulty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the present airline strike and the possible intervention by Congress in this dispute point the finger of blame at the actual root of the trouble which is the Great Society's unwise fiscal policy.

Inflation, skyrocketing Government spending and a 3.5 percent jump in the cost of living in the past year are the principal reasons why the American public is now inconvenienced by the strike.

No one can really blame American labor for their fear that any contractual gains will only be lost in the galloping inflation. And no one can really blame business which is feeling the pinch resulting from inflation.

More than likely Congress will act this week, but the chief cause of the difficulty will remain. Administration-fostered inflation will continue to hamper both business and labor.

Civil Rights Act of 1966

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 9, 1966

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the 1966 Civil Rights Act although I am concerned and disappointed that title IV of the bill has been amended to eliminate large areas of housing from its provisions, and although I believe that the amendment to title V introduced by the gentlemen from Florida represents an unfortunate response to an unfortunate situation.

However, Mr. Chairman, this legislation, and particularly title IV, is of the greatest of significance for millions of Americans whose rights it assures and protects. And, importantly, it also protects the rights of those who follow us.

For, by 1975, the population of the United States will jump to almost 223 million, a rise from present levels of about 25 million citizens, equal to the entire U.S. population in the immediate pre-Civil War period. Between 1960 and 1975, the urban population alone will skyrocket from 125 to 171 million. In 1975, there will be roughly 9½ million more households in the United States than presently, and more than 20 million new housing units will be built in new suburban and exurban communities which will virtually double our Nation's metropolitan areas.

The great question then, Mr. Chairman, is whether a large portion of those new people in those new households, in addition to the current population, will face discrimination in housing merely because of their skin color, religion, or national origin? How many of those new people would have to face the stigma of living in a slum or a ghetto if we do not pass title IV of the 1966 Civil Rights Act—even in its weakened form as amended?

Mr. Chairman, it would be the greatest of tragedies if the new communities which will explode across the face of our nation during the next decade are not open to all citizens on a free and equal basis, as their purses and their tastes lead them. This legislation mandates a national commitment to close the door once and for all on those backward few among us who would welcome only some Americans into these new cities, and who would exclude by group label millions of other American citizens.

At last we will have placed the majesty of our Federal Government behind

the dream of an open society which welcomes all Americans into free and equal participation.

Knoxville Endorsed Tax Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 10, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced legislation—H.R. 10696—which would authorize the Federal Government to return up to 5 percent of its income to the States to help finance their educational systems. I have been heartened by the support the tax-sharing concept has received from educators, economists, Governors, Members of Congress, and local governments. Now, I am happy to include among the support of this legislative approach to relieving the financial pinch on local and State governments the Knoxville, Tenn., City Council. I have unanimous consent that a resolution adopted on June 28, 1966 by the city council be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 3429

Resolution of the Council of the City of Knoxville endorsing a proposal calling for the return of a portion of Federal income tax funds to local communities without conditions as to use

Whereas, conventional methods of local taxation throughout the United States and specifically including Knoxville and Knox County are rapidly approaching the limits of financial endurance by local taxpayers; and

Whereas, the 1966 United States Conference of Mayors has adopted a resolution calling upon the President and Congress to consider and adopt a tax sharing program under which a portion of the Federal Income Tax will be returned directly to local communities without conditions as to use; and

Whereas, such a program will reduce the need for the ponderous and costly Federal bureaucracy which currently operates to distribute Federal Funds to local communities and units of government through Federal grants; and

Whereas, the delays encountered in processing applications for Federal Funds and in returning such funds to Local Governments would be eliminated to the benefit of the local taxpayers from whom such funds are derived; and

Whereas, the provision of Federal Funds through restrictive and complicated Federal programs seriously encroaches upon the right of the people to govern themselves, does not make the most economic use of the tax dollar, and does not allow the most proper management of local fiscal affairs.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the council of the city of Knoxville:

SECTION 1. That this Council does hereby commit its unqualified endorsement to the proposal that a percentage of the Federal Income Tax collected be returned to the communities from which it is derived, without restriction or conditions as to the use thereof.

SEC. 2. That the members of Congress representing this area, the Senators of the State

August 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18025

based upon a belief that such an alien could easily return to his own country to procure a visa, it is clear that such an assumption is not valid for Cubans because they cannot return to their homeland for that purpose.

The Department favors and supports the objectives of H.R. 15183 and, accordingly, the Department of Justice recommends enactment of this bill. . . .

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAYS CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT TARGET OF COMMUNISTS

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the wave of riots and anarchy which has erupted in many of the larger cities has been a cause of great concern to all of us.

One of the most disturbing aspects of this civil strife has been the similarity of the consistent pattern and techniques that appear in these outbreaks of violence and the modus operandi of the Communist Party in its agitation around the world. This has raised a question as to whether, and to what extent, these riots have been influenced by Communists.

Columnist Jack Anderson said in the Washington Post of July 27 last:

The FBI has positive evidence that professional Communist agitators have helped to stir up recent Negro riots.

In the same connection, I wrote the Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States on October 20, 1965, and again July 27 last, requesting an investigation to determine whether, and to what extent, Communist infiltration and incitement had contributed to the riots and civil strife that have been occurring.

By letter dated August 8, 1966, Mr. J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General, Internal Security Division, Department of Justice, has written to me in reply to my letter to Attorney General Katzenbach, pointing up the investigations currently underway, and making other pertinent comments regarding the violence, which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues and others.

I ask unanimous assent that the letter from Mr. J. Walter Yeagley be included in the Record, together with my own letter to Attorney General Katzenbach, and the press report in the Washington Post dated July 27, 1966.

The letters and article follow:

JULY 27, 1966.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On October 20, 1965, I wrote you requesting an investigation of the extent of Communist infiltration and incitement of the riots and civil strife that have been occurring—and are continuing to occur in major cities of our Nation. It appears that rather than diminishing the riots are increasing to the point that in some cities virtual anarchy prevails in certain areas.

I am advised that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has found indications that certain of these riots are Communist inspired and agitated. In this connection, I would now like for you to send me a substantive report on the result of the FBI's investigation into this increasing wave of civil strife—what the FBI has determined, what action has been taken, what action is being taken and what specific action is planned.

An immediate report on this is urged and will be appreciated.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, August 8, 1966.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of July 27, 1966, concerning possible Communist-inspired or -agitated riots and civil strife.

With reference to those demonstrations directed primarily against our policy in Vietnam, the organization known as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) has often been an organizer or a key participant. In October of 1965 the Attorney General instructed the FBI to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in the SDS.

Literature distributed by the SDS discloses that in 1905 a group of students and young professionals banded together to form the Intercollegiate Socialist Society which in 1917 changed its name to the League for Industrial Democracy. The literature claims that during the 1920's the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the student department of the League for Industrial Democracy, distributed socialist literature, organized aid for striking workers and the unemployed, fought R.O.T.C. programs on college campuses, and organized student strikes for peace. According to the literature, the Student League for Industrial Democracy was reorganized in 1960 as the Students for a Democratic Society, and since 1962 has operated as an autonomous body. In late 1965 the SDS and the League issued a joint statement in which they mutually agreed to sever connections and disassociate.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has reported in "Turbulence on the Campus" as follows:

"At the core of the extremist elements of the New Left are doctrines of civil disobedience, disrespect for our constitutional process, and a desire to revolt against our economic, political, and social system. One of the most vociferous groups in the New Left is the Students for a Democratic Society, many of whose members dress in beatnik style. Here are some typical comments heard at a recent meeting of this group:

"When we have this utopia where everybody only works two hours a day, the processes of redistribution of power and economy will take care of themselves."

"We are a socialist youth organ and consider ourselves a revolutionary organization whose members do not believe society can be reformed as it presently exists."

With reference to disturbances involving racial issues, the Attorney General and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have pointed out on a number of occasions that the civil rights movement is an obvious target for Communist infiltration, and its leaders should continue to be alerted to this possibility.

Mr. Hoover, in an address delivered before the Pennsylvania Society and the Society of Pennsylvania Women, stated:

"Let me emphasize that the American civil rights movement is not, and has never been

dominated by the Communists because the overwhelming majority of civil rights leaders in this country, both Negro and white, have recognized and rejected Communism as a menace to the freedoms of all. But there are notable exceptions—dangerous opportunists and morally corrupt charlatans who would form an alliance with any organization, regardless of its nature, to advance their own power and prestige."

With regard to suggestions in the public press that some of the recent strife may have been planned and organized by followers of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), or similar organizations, I can say that we do not have sufficient evidence at this time to support such a conclusion.

Every effort is made to keep abreast of subversive activity for purposes of formulating policy, initiating prosecutions, and proposing new legislation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has always provided excellent coverage of Communist Party and other subversive activities, and all pertinent information developed by the FBI is regularly furnished to the appropriate officials of the executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government. When sufficient evidence is available to show that a federal statute has been violated, this Department will promptly take appropriate action.

I trust that the foregoing will be of assistance to you. If I can be of help in any other matter, please do not hesitate to communicate with me.

Sincerely,

J. WALTER YEAGLEY,
Assistant Attorney General.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 27, 1966]

SAME REDS IN 2 CITIES' RIOTS (By Jack Anderson)

The FBI has positive evidence that professional Communist agitators have helped to stir up recent Negro riots.

This doesn't mean that the riots were provoked or controlled by the Communists. However, some of the same agitators who helped fire the mobs in Los Angeles were spotted egging on the rioters in Chicago.

The FBI also has evidence that the teenage gangs were taking orders from adults behind the scenes. Some messages were actually transmitted in code over a Chicago radio station.

What worries government officials is that similar riots are planned for other cities, including New York City, Baltimore and Washington.

(Mr. CRALEY (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CRALEY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

EFFECTS OF VIETNAM CONFLICT ON AMERICAN POLITICS

(Mr. CRALEY (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the Record the continuation of a series of articles on the American economy, the first of which I added to the Record yesterday. The article, taken from the New York Times, August 9, continues Mr. Tom Wicker's

18026

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 10, 1966

analysis of the effects of the Vietnam conflict on the American economy, this one discussing the impact on politics:

POLITICIANS SEE WAR ISSUE HURTING DEMOCRATS IN FALL—PARTY'S CANDIDATES EXPECTED TO SUFFER UNLESS THE CONFLICT IS 'GOING WELL'—JOHNSON'S GRIP FOUND WEAKER

(This is the second of four articles in which correspondents of The New York Times estimate the impact of the Vietnam war on the American economy, the nation's politics, the lives of its citizens and its foreign policy.)

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—Glenn Carney, whose work as a lobbyist and public relations man for the Anaconda Copper Company has made him an astute and experienced analyst of Montana politics, was asked recently what effect the war in Vietnam would have on Democratic Senator LEE METCALF's re-election chances.

"The better the war goes," Mr. Carney said, "the more it helps the Democrats. The worse it goes, the more it helps the Republicans."

The answer was somewhat paradoxical because the Senator has been a mild critic of the war, one of 15 Senators who signed a letter to President Johnson in January asking him not to resume the bombing of North Vietnam. His conservative Republican opponent, Gov. Tim M. Babcock, intends to make that letter a campaign issue.

Nevertheless, political analysts, candidates, reporters and strategists across the nation tend to agree with Mr. Carney's assessment of the impact of the war on American politics.

They also tend to agree that the war, as yet, is not "going well enough" to be of assistance to the Democrats in this year's elections. In fact, most politicians believe that if anything, the war issue is likely to be damaging to Democratic candidates this year.

Gov. Grant Sawyer of Nevada, for example, a supporter of the Johnson policy, nevertheless believes that the frustrations and uncertainties of the war will do him more harm than good in his re-election campaign. Eugene Nickerson, a leading candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of New York, has said that he expects his party to "get it from both sides"—from those who want a greater peace effort and those who want a stronger war effort.

There is even wider agreement among political figures, however, that no sure predictions can be made. The dominant fact of politics today is that candidates and managers all over the country are nervous about what the war means to them, hesitant as to the safest or most profitable position to take, and in many cases reluctant to discuss it publicly.

Despite the prevailing uncertainties about its direct effect on the over-all campaign this year, or any specific election this year or later, it is plain that the impact of the Vietnam war on American politics has been sharp and perhaps in some ways lasting.

JOHNSON ON THE SPOT

It has embroiled the President in the major controversy of his career, cracked if not shattered the overwhelming consensus he was able to build up and maintain well past his landslide election in 1964, shifted attention from the domestic legislative achievements that he and his party registered in 1964 and 1965, shaken his once powerful influence in Congress, reawakened the liberal-to-left opposition his domestic successes and his campaign against Barry Goldwater had silenced, and may well have focused his political future and that of his Administration on the outcome—or even the progress—of a war many Americans thought they would never see stall in voting for him.

Because he has loyally supported Mr. Johnson on the Vietnam issue, Vice President HUMPHREY has been damaged with the liberal elements of the Democratic party on which he has based his career.

Aside from the fact that he must sink or swim with Mr. Johnson's policy, Mr. HUMPHREY at the very least has not been able to enhance his own chances for a future Presidency, and probably has seen those chances diminish.

KENNEDY WINNING SUPPORT

On the other hand, as Mr. Johnson's left flank has become politically exposed, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY of New York has become the most obvious rival to the President for the leadership of the Democratic party. By cautiously dissenting from the heavy reliance of the Administration on military action, and by suggesting such diplomatic initiatives as direct dealings with the Communist Vietcong, Mr. KENNEDY has earned favor among liberals who had formerly distrusted him and appears now to be the political heir of his brother, President Kennedy.

So sharply has Mr. KENNEDY emerged as an apparent rival to the President that some danger may exist of a premature Presidential boom on his behalf. He has denied any intention to seek the Democratic nomination in 1968 and few serious political figures attribute any such ambition to him.

However, if a strong liberal move in his behalf should develop—and it is talked of in some political circles—it could seriously embarrass the President and Mr. KENNEDY, and disrupt both the Democratic party and the already strained relations between the two men.

On the Republican side, the issue poses both opportunity and danger, in 1966 and 1968. Although many Republicans hope that a protest vote against Democratic management of the war will bring them significant gains this year, most Republicans have backed the President, either from conviction, bipartisanship or a reluctance to appear to be "playing politics with the war." Thus, they cannot freely exploit whatever public dissatisfaction with the war there may be.

For 1968, widespread and general frustration with the war and Mr. Johnson's leadership would clearly provide the Republicans with their best—perhaps their only—hope of victory. Yet the party might experience considerable difficulty in taking advantage of such a situation.

For one thing it would require some sophisticated political footwork for the Republican party to provide a clear alternative to Mr. Johnson's policy without becoming vulnerable to charges of offering—in the President's phrase of 1964—"more war or more appeasement."

For another thing, the gap on the Vietnam issue is widening between the two leading Republican Presidential contenders. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon has consistently advocated a harder military line, and could hardly campaign for the Presidency on any other policy. Gov. George Romney of Michigan, although he has both muted and fuzzed his dissent, has clearly tried to remain flexible enough to run something of a "peace campaign" if he is nominated in 1968.

Thus, a split on the issue at the next national convention could add to the already deep divisions of the Republican party.

RADICAL WING DEVELOPING

There also exists, as a result of the Vietnam controversy, a possibility that could have even more lasting effects than these. There is now visible a movement toward a radical political party in America, splitting off from the old-line Democratic party and weakening it, as in some states the formation of a new party has already begun. This weakened the Republicans.

Seizing on the "peace issue," numerous candidates have entered Congressional races—in Connecticut, California, New York, Wisconsin, Oregon, New Jersey, Indiana and elsewhere. Most are running as Democrats, some as independents, but almost all outside of or without the blessing of Democratic leaders and organizations.

So far, little success for these candidates is in sight—and two of the most vigorous have gone down to defeat. In Oregon's Democratic primary, Howard Morgan lost a statewide race for the senatorial nomination to Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, despite the strong support of Senator WAYNE MORSE. In California, a youthful radical editor, Robert Scheer, offered a well-organized and tough opposition to Representative JEFFERY COHELAN, an old-line liberal from the Berkeley-Oakland area, but Mr. Scheer lost a close race in the Democratic primary.

Nevertheless, the vigor and numbers of the "peace candidates"—who are distinct from those otherwise regular Democrats who may dissent from the President's line—is impressive, and the Vietnam issue, if it remains alive until 1968, could crystallize the so-called "new left" into a potent new political force.

NEGRO VOTE CITED

This prospect particularly worries some Democrats because they see the possibility that the new left might absorb great numbers of Negro voters who in recent years have supported Democratic tickets. Their reasoning is that these Negroes might become convinced that war expenditures of money and energy have halted the momentum of the civil rights movement in the United States.

A politically powerful new left built on the Vietnam and civil rights issues appears unlikely to most professional politicians. The most far-sighted of them, however, are dismissing the possibility.

Nevertheless, for the immediate future, only Glenn Carney's proposition that a successful war is likely to benefit President Johnson's party has any wide acceptance. The basic problem for most politicians is that they do not know whether to gamble on that success, or on the alternative possibility that the war will drag on indecisively and arouse strong opposition to those who have managed and favored it.

This dilemma is heightened by the fact that many political figures today have two elections in mind. Even those reasonably convinced that there will be no striking success in the war by November, 1966, cannot be sure that such success will not have come by the Presidential year of 1968.

"SUCCESS" NEEDS DEFINING

Another complicating question is how to define success in the war. Would a negotiated settlement provide a popular ending, or does the public mood now demand some demonstrable military victory?

Opinion polls, after all, showed public approval both of the President's January "peace offensive" and his decision in July to bomb the oil dumps near Hanoi and Haiphong.

Ultimately confusing the issue are two political truisms. One is that patriotism demands support for American troops in action, even from those who do not approve of the war. The other is that in foreign crises the general tendency of the American public usually has been to support the President of the United States.

For all these reasons, only those candidates this year who have firmly held views of their own and who are willing to risk the consequences of stating them are likely to take particular issue with Mr. Johnson's policy of a limited war for limited aims.

However, even those who are willing to dispute the President are not united. Some wish an all-out military effort, including the use of nuclear weapons against China. Others wish to reduce by various means the present

August 10, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18027

level of the military effort, although most stop short of urging complete withdrawal.

NO CLEAR-CUT PATTERN

Thus, as this year's political season moves toward its climax in November, no clear-cut pattern has developed around the Vietnam issue. Instead anomalies, contradictions and surprises abound. Here are some examples:

Many members of Congress who would normally be eager to get home to their campaigns in an election year are hoping the current session drags on into the fall so that they will not have to face too long a period of challenge about Vietnam.

President Johnson, however, in several early campaign forays, has made it plain that he intends to make support for the war a primary issue this fall—in defiance of the uncertainty of other politicians, of the general belief that his party's domestic record provides a better political argument, and of the fact that the most intense criticism of the war has come from Democrats such as Senators Morse of Oregon and J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas.

The prime political concern of the Democratic party this fall is to return to office many of the bumper crop of freshman Democrats who were elected to the House in the Johnson landslide in 1964, and 48 of whom won seats away from Republicans. However, 25 of these freshmen Democrats have tended toward criticism of the war effort, some even to sharp disagreement.

It is generally believed that Gov. Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon, one of the nation's better-known Republicans, unnecessarily risked his chances for election to the Senate by taking a strong position in opposition to the war. Now he is rated not much better than an even bet against Democratic Republican Duncan, who supports the President's policy and probably would not have been in the race had Mr. Hatfield not raised the Vietnam issue.

In what is widely considered the most important race of the year—that between Gov. Edmund G. Brown of California and his Republican challenger, Ronald Reagan—the war is not an issue at all, and neither candidate gives any indication that he will mention it.

Finally, most political analysts believe that the war, its frustrations and its peripheral effects—after prices and "tight money," for example—have badly damaged the President's always tenuous popularity. These same analysts concede, however, that the "safest" position on the war is probably one of simple support for the President's policy, because he is assumed to be the man "in the best position to know what to do."

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LBJ AND THE CITIES

(Mr. FARNSLEY (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record an article that appeared in the Washington Post of August 10, 1966, by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak about "LBJ and the Cities":

INSIDE REPORT: LBJ AND THE CITIES
(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Although saying little publicly about the growing crisis of the Negro revolution in the big cities, President Johnson is working overtime in quiet ways to defuse the Nation's worst domestic problem.

One revealing glimpse of Mr. Johnson's private efforts came in a conversation (fruitless, as it turned out) with Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia, a conservative Democrat and former Johnson ally who is now systematically opposing Great Society programs.

The call had one purpose: To line up Byrd's vote in the Senate Appropriations Committee last Thursday, when the rent-supplement bill was to come up for decision. Although this bill contains only \$20 million for a pilot rent-subsidy program designed to break up Negro housing patterns in the big cities, Byrd was adamant. He told the President no! Said the President, according to Byrd's own account a few days later:

"All I'm trying to do is to help these people get out of the ratholes and let them see a little sunlight."

Byrd, whose state has no major cities at all, was unmoved. The problem, he told Mr. Johnson, is the Negroes themselves, not the Government. When the President warned that failure to make a start now at helping the Negro masses in the North would guarantee a far worse crisis in the future, Byrd only shrugged his shoulders.

When the rent-supplement program was approved in committee on a close vote last Thursday, Byrd showed up with a couple of proxies of absent Senators and cast them, along with his own, against this modest pilot program.

What the President attempted to do with Byrd is only one small example—the tip of the iceberg—of his desperate effort to take the violence out of the Negro revolution.

For example, it is a well-kept secret that Mr. Johnson has dispatched a top-level team of White House aides to at least four major cities in the North, and one in the South, to discuss education, employment, housing—and the racial crisis—with university and political experts.

Headed by Joseph Califano, these White House teams are giving the President new insights into the problems of the big city, the flight of the whites to the suburbs and the dynamics of the Negro revolution. Harry McPherson, the White House counsel, and Douglass Cater, the President's chief for educational matters, also have been assigned by the President to this work.

Beyond that, Mr. Johnson's personal intervention in a problem right on his doorstep—the possibility of a racial flare-up in the Capital—is now being studied in governors' offices across the country. When Mr. Johnson read a story in The Washington Post that Negro children could not turn on the fire hydrants in a bitter heat wave and play in the spray (a problem that triggered the riots on Chicago's West Side), he ordered Califano to step in.

Califano summoned District authorities to his office. Why no hydrants, he demanded? The answer: It would use too much water. How much? No one knew.

Califano demanded immediate answers and got them. The amount of water expended would be minuscule. What about collapsible swimming pools at strategic locations in the Negro ghetto. The District officials said no, they could never get enough lifeguards.

Acting under presidential mandate, Califano discovered by one telephone call to the Red Cross that a nonswimmer could become a full-fledged lifeguard within four weeks, a swimmer within one week. The hydrants were turned on and pools were ordered.

Still another example. A month ago, the President's top priority to the racial crisis in the big cities, the demonstration cities bill, was marked down as dated. Now, because of presidential missionary work, it's given at least a 50-50 chance.

Although public silence conceals these presidential initiatives, they prove how deeply aware Mr. Johnson is of the disaster that lurks in major American cities today.

ATTORNEYS' FEES BILL

(Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mr. GILLIGAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to testify before this distinguished subcommittee on a proposed reform which I consider of the utmost importance.

H.R. 12530, which I introduced in February of this year, would remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies.

At present, most Federal agencies are hampered by statutory restrictions as to attorneys' fees. Many of these limitations are outdated and most award fees which are not sufficient compensation for the legal services rendered. The cost of living has increased substantially since many of these limits were set. In some cases, attorneys are paid different amounts when practicing before different agencies though the nature of the work is very similar.

My bill is in the spirit of the Administrative Procedures Act. For years, Congress has sought to establish in the administrative agencies as much uniformity as possible considering the many diverse roles and responsibilities the Federal Government has assumed. The Administrative Procedures Act is a testimony to the success with which many of the procedures of these agencies have been simplified and their various procedural differences minimized.

H.R. 12530 provides that all agencies which are stung by restrictions as to attorneys' fees would be governed by one flexible standard in lieu of their present economic differentiations in the matter of attorneys' fees.

The basis established in this bill for determining attorneys' fees is one that has long served the legal profession well. This is the rule of reasonableness.

The affected agencies will be enabled to enact such rules and regulations as they deem proper to insure that attorneys' fees will be an "amount equal to the reasonable value of the services rendered." This bill would, in effect, end present maximum and minimum limitations and any penalties which are presently imposed when these limitations are violated.